

BUREAU OF EDUCATION
INDIA

Pamphlet No. 18

Conference of Indian Universities

Held in May 1924

AT

SIMLA.



CALCUTTA: GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH
1924

**Government of India Publications are obtainable from
the Government of India Central Publication
Branch, 8, Hastings Street, Calcutta,
and from the following Agents :—**

EUROPE.

Constable & Co., 10, Orange Street, Leicester Square, London, W.C.
Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 68-74, Carter Lane, E.C., and 39, New Oxford Street, London, W.C.
Bernard Quaritch, 11, Grafton Street, New Bond Street, London, W.
F. S. King & Sons, 2 & 4, Great Smith Street, Westminster, London, S. W.
Grindlay & Co., 54, Parliament Street, London, S.W.
Luzac & Co., 43, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.
W. Thacker & Co., 2, Creed Lane, London, E.C.
T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd., 1, Adelphi Terrace, London, W.C.

Wheldon and Wesley, Ltd., 2, 3 & 4, Arthur Street, New Oxford Street, London, W.C. 2.
East and West Ltd., 3, Victoria Street, London, S.W. 1.
B. H. Blackwell, 50 & 51, Broad Street, Oxford.
Deighton Bell & Co., Ltd., Cambridge.
Oliver and Boyd, Tweeddale Court, Edinburgh.
E. Ponsonby, Ltd., 118, Grafton Street, Dublin.
Ernest Leroux, 28, Rue Bonaparte, Paris.
Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Holland.
Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig.
Friedländer und Sohn, Berlin.

INDIA AND CEYLON.

Thacker, Spink & Co., Calcutta and Simla.
W. Newman & Co., Ltd., Calcutta.
B. Cambray & Co., Calcutta.
S. K. Lahiri & Co., Calcutta.
The Indian School Supply Depot, 309, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta, and 226, Nawabpur, Dacca.
Butterworth & Co. (India), Ltd., Calcutta.
Rai M. C. Sarcar Bahadur & Sons, 90-2A, Harrison Road, Calcutta.
The Weldon Library, 26, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta.
Standard Literature Company, Limited, Calcutta.
Association Press, Calcutta.
Chukervetty, Chatterjee & Co., Ltd., 13, College Square, Calcutta.
Higginbotham & Co., Madras.
V. Kalyanarama Iyer & Co., Madras.
P. R. Rama Iyer & Co., Madras.
Rochouse and Sons, Madras.
Bright & Co., Trivandrum.
V. S. Swaminathan, Bookseller, West Tower Street, Madras.
Thacker & Co., Ltd., Bombay.
D. B. Taraporevala, Sons & Co., Bombay.
Sunder Pandurang, Bombay.
Ram Chandra Govind & Sons, Kalbadevi, Bombay.
Proprietor, New Kitabkhana, Poona.
The Manager, Oriental Book Supplying Agency, 15, Shukrawar, Poona City.
The Standard Bookstall, Kamehi, Rawalpindi, Murree, Lahore and Quetta.

Karsandas Narandas & Sons, Surat.
A. H. Wheeler & Co., Allahabad, Calcutta and Bombay.
N. B. Mathur, Supdt., Nazir Kanun Hind Press, Allahabad.
The North India Christian Tract and Book Society, 18, Olive Road, Allahabad.
Ram Dayal Agarwala, 184, Katra, Allahabad.
Manager, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow.
The Upper India Publishing House, Ltd., 41, Aminabad Park, Lucknow.
Munshi Seeta Ram, Managing Proprietor, Indian Army Book Depot, Juhl, Cawnpore.
Rai Sahib M. Gulab Singh & Sons, Mufid-i-Am Press, Lahore and Allahabad.
Rama Krishna & Sons, Booksellers, Anarkali, Lahore.
Manager of the Imperial Book Depot, 63, Chandney Chawk Street, Delhi.
Oxford Book and Stationery Company, Delhi.
Supdt., American Baptist Mission Press, Rangoon.
Proprietor, Rangoon Times Press, Rangoon.
The Modern Publishing House, Ltd., 70, Sparks Street, Rangoon.
The International Buddhist Book Depot, Post Box No. 971, Rangoon.
Manager, the "Hitavada," Nagpur.
S. C. Talukdar, Proprietor, Students & Co. Cooch Behar.
Times of Ceylon Co., Ltd.
The Manager, Ceylon Observer, Colombo.

REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITIES' CONFERENCE.

Held at Simla from May the 19th to the 24th, 1924.

	PAGE.
Programme	iii
List of delegates who attended the Conference	v
Chapter I.—Inaugural address by His Excellency the Viceroy	1
Chapter II.—Proceedings of May the 19th	8
Chapter III.—Proceedings of May the 20th	11
Chapter IV.—Proceedings of May the 21st	20
Chapter V.—Proceedings of May the 21st (<i>concluded</i>) and of May the 22nd	29
Chapter VI.—Proceedings of May the 23rd	35
Appendix A.—Addresses by the Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma—	
(i) introductory address;	45
(ii) valedictory address	48
Appendix B.—Notes supplied to the delegates on items of the agenda	53
Appendix C.—Resolutions passed by the Conference . .	70
Appendix D.—Report of the Provisional Committee held on May the 24th	77

PROGRAMME OF THE UNIVERSITIES' CONFERENCE.

May 19th . 10-30 A.M. . Delegates assemble at Committee Room B of the Legislative Assembly Building.

11-00 A.M. . Address by His Excellency the Viceroy in the Legislative Assembly Chamber.

12-00 NOON to 1 P.M. . Appointment of four committees to consider the following subjects:—

(i) (a) the appointment and conditions of service of whole-time university teachers;

(b) the exchange of university teachers.

(ii) The exchange of library books.

(iii) The publication of an Indian journal of science.

(iv) The equivalence of Indian university examinations.

2-30 P.M. to 4-30 P.M.

(v) The substitution of university bureaux for students' advisory committees. The constitution of a central university agency in London.

(vi) The recognition of Indian examinations in the United Kingdom with special reference to:—

(a) the new regulations of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; and

(b) the holding of examinations by English universities in India.

May 20th Meetings of committees.

May 21st . 10-30 A.M. to 12-30 P.M. . (vii) University training corps.

(viii) The recognition of the final examination of the Prince of Wales' College, Dehra Dun, as equivalent to the Intermediate examination.

- (ix) The question of admitting students of Indian Universities to direct King's Commissions on the system adopted at Oxford and Cambridge Universities.
- 12-30 P.M. to 1-30 P.M. (x) Place of modern languages in the curricula of Indian Universities:—
- (a) Indian vernaculars;
- (b) European languages used in scientific literature.
- 2-45 P.M. to 4-30 P.M. Reports of Committees on items (i) and (ii).
- May 22nd . 10-30 A.M. to 1-15 P.M. Reports of Committees on items (iii) and (iv).
- 2-45 P.M. to 4-30 P.M. (xi) Methods of co-operation between Indian Universities, including:—
- (a) specialisation in higher studies;
- (b) co-operation in research; and
- (c) the proposal to form some permanent inter-university organisation.
- May 23rd This day is reserved for the completion of adjourned discussions or the consideration of additional topics not included in the agenda.

List of Delegates who attended the Universities' Conference.

University.	Names of Delegates.
1. Calcutta	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="425 315 886 399">1. The Hon'ble Mr. Abul Kasim Fazl-ul-Haq, M.A., B.L., Minister for Education, Bengal. <li data-bbox="425 404 886 539">2. Sir Nilratan Sircar, Kt., M.A., M.D., LL.D., D.C.L., President of the Governing Body of the Carmichael Medical College, Belgachia. <li data-bbox="425 544 886 628">3. Mr. Herambachandra Maitra, M.A., Principal, City College, Calcutta. <li data-bbox="425 633 886 717">4. Revd. Dr. W. S. Urquhart, M.A., D.Litt., Principal, Scottish Churches College, Calcutta. <li data-bbox="425 722 886 808">5. Dr. C. V. Raman, F.R.S., M.A., D.Sc., Palit Professor of Physics, Calcutta University.
2. Bombay	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="425 813 886 947">6. The Hon'ble Sir Chimanlal H. Setalvad, Kt., B.A., LL.B., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor, Bombay University, and President, Legislative Assembly. <li data-bbox="425 952 886 1070">7. The Hon'ble Sir Lalubhai Asharam Shah, Kt., M.A., LL.B., Puisne Judge, High Court of Judicature, Bombay. <li data-bbox="425 1075 886 1186">8. Mr. V. G. Kale, M.A., Professor of History and Economics, Fergusson College, Poona, and Member, Tariff Board, Simla.
3. Madras	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="425 1192 886 1327">9. The Hon'ble the Revd. E. Monteith Macphail, M.A., D.D., C.B.E., Vice-Chancellor, Madras University, and Member, Council of State. <li data-bbox="425 1332 886 1416">10. Mr. R. Littlehales, M.A., M.L.A., Director of Public Instruction, Madras. <li data-bbox="425 1421 886 1505">11. M. R. Ry. Diwan Bahadur Mocherla Ramachandrarao Pantulu Garu, M.L.A. <li data-bbox="425 1510 886 1572">12. The Hon'ble Mr. G. A. Natesan, Member. Council of State.

University.	Names of Delegates.
4. Punjab . . .	<p>13. The Hon'ble Sir John Maynard, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., Vice-Chancellor, Punjab University.</p> <p>14. The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Mian Fazl-i-Hussain, Minister for Education, Punjab.</p> <p>15. Mr. A. C. Woolner, M.A., Principal, Oriental College, Lahore, and Dean of University Instruction, Punjab University.</p> <p>16. Mr. Manohar Lal, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Lahore.</p> <p>17. Rai Sahib Shiv Ram Kashyap, B.A., M.Sc., Professor, Government College, Lahore.</p>
5. Allahabad . . .	<p>18. Dr. N. R. Dhar, D.Sc., Docteur de Sciences Physiques, F.I.C., F.C.S., Dean of the Faculty of Science, Allahabad University.</p> <p>19. Dr. Ganesh Prasad, M.A., D.Sc., M.L.C., Member of the Executive Council of the Allahabad University.</p> <p>20. Mr. P. S. Burrell, M.A., Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Allahabad University.</p> <p>21. Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan, M.A., Litt.D., M.L.C., Head of History Department, Allahabad University.</p>
6. Benares Hindu . . .	<p>22. Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya, B.A., LL.B., M.L.A., Vice-Chancellor, Benares Hindu University.</p> <p>23. Mr. A. B. Dhruva, M.A., LL.B., Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Dean of the Faculty of Arts, University Professor of Sanskrit, and Principal, Central Hindu College, Benares Hindu University.</p> <p>24. Mr. L. D. Coueslant, B.Sc., Patiala Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Benares Hindu University.</p> <p>25. Dr. S. S. Bhatnagar, D.Sc., University Professor of Chemistry, Benares Hindu University.</p> <p>26. Mr. P. Seshadri, M.A., Head of the Department of English Studies, Benares Hindu University.</p>

University.	Names of Delegates.
7. Mysore . . .	27. Mr. N. S. Subba Rao, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Member of the Mysore University Council.
8. Patna . . .	28. Mr. S. Sultan Ahmad, Barrister-at-Law, Vice-Chancellor, Patna University. 29. Mr. H. Lambert, M.A., Director of Public Instruction, Bihar and Orissa. 30. Mr. E. A. Horne, M.A., Principal, Patna College. 31. Mr. Sri Narayan Sahay, B.A., B.Sc., Barrister-at-Law, Professor, Patna Law College.
9. Osmania . . .	32. Nawab Hyder Nawaz Jang Bahadur (Mr. A. Hydari), B.A., Finance Member, Executive Council, and Member, University Council. 33. Nawab Masood Jang Bahadur (Syed Ross Masood), B.A., Director of Public Instruction, and Member, University Council. 34. Dr. A. Siddiqi, M.A., Ph.D., Principal, Osmania University.
10. Aligarh Muslim	35. Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad, C.I.E., M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., M.L.C., Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University. 36. Dr. L. K. Hyder, B.A., Ph.D., M.L.A., Professor of Economics, Aligarh Muslim University. 37. Dr. A. S. Tritton, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of Arabic, Aligarh Muslim University.
11. Rangoon . . .	38. Mr. L. G. Owen, M.A., Professor of Mathematics, Government College, Rangoon. 39. Mr. A. Campbell, M.A., Registrar, Rangoon University.
12. Lucknow . . .	40. Dr. K. N. Bahl, M.Sc., D.Phil., D.Sc., Professor, Lucknow University. 41. Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji, M.A., Ph.D., P.R.S., Professor, Lucknow University.

University.	Names of Delegates.
13. Dacca	42. Mr. P. J. Hartog, C.I.E., M.A., B.Sc., L.-es-Sc., Vice-Chancellor, Dacca University.
	43. Dr. R. C. Mazumdar, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of History and Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Dacca University.
	44. Dr. J. C. Ghosh, D.Sc., Professor of Chemistry and Dean of the Faculty of Science, Dacca University.
14. Delhi	45. Dr. H. S. Gour, M.A., D.Litt., D.C.L., LL.D., M.L.A., Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University.
	46. The Revd. P. N. F. Young, M.A., St. Stephen's College, Delhi.
	47. Mr. Khub Ram, M.A., M.Sc., Dean of the Faculty of Science, Delhi University.
	48. Mr. H. L. Chabiani, M.A., Reader in Economics, Delhi University.
15. Nagpur	49. Rao Bahadur V. R. Pandit, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Nagpur.
	50. Mr. G. G. R. Hunter, M.A., Professor of History, Morris College, Nagpur.
	51. Mr. F. P. Tostevin, M.A., Principal, King Edward College, Amraoti.

Representative of the Post-Diploma Examination classes of the Mayo College, Ajmer.

52. Mr. S. F. Madden, B.A., O.B.E., Principal, Mayo College, Ajmer.

Secretary to the Conference.

Professor L. F. Rushbrook Williams,
M.A., B.Litt., C.B.E., M.L.A.

Mr. J. A. Richey, M.A., C.I.E., Educational Commissioner with the Government of India.

Members of the Standing Advisory Committee of the Indian Legislature for the Department of Education, Health and Lands, who attended the Conference by invitation.

1. The Hon'ble Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, Kt., C.I.E., Member of the Council of State.
2. Maulvi Muhammad Yakub, M.L.A.

Conference of Indian Universities held in May 1924 at Simla.

CHAPTER I.

Inaugural Address by His Excellency the Viceroy.

The Conference was formally opened by His Excellency the Viceroy at 11 A.M. on May the 19th in the Legislative Assembly Chamber. His Excellency the Governor of the Punjab, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council, the President of the Council of State and other high officials of the Government of India were present on the occasion. His Excellency the Viceroy addressed the delegates as follows:—

Let me extend a warm welcome to the delegates of the Universities of India who are assembled here for the Conference. I am conscious that many of you have travelled considerable distances to attend this Conference at a season of the year when unfortunately the rigours of the climate add in a material degree to the fatigue and discomfort inseparable at all times from long journeys. In many cases also, I know that your absence from your other duties and preoccupations at this time has only been arranged at considerable personal inconvenience and sacrifice. I and my Government highly appreciate the sense of public duty, of interest in the objects of the Conference and of keenness to take part in any measure to advance the well-being of the Universities which has prompted you to accept our invitation; and we are grateful to the governing bodies of the Universities for their ready and willing response to our suggestion for the Conference. I am confident that my Government will profit by the Conference and acquire a most useful store of advice on the important questions to be discussed from the united wisdom of so distinguished a body of representatives; and I believe the results will be generally acknowledged by the Universities also to be highly beneficial to the best interests of the Universities and of University teaching.

This is the first Conference of the kind that has been held and I welcome this opportunity of inaugurating its proceedings. Ever since I came to India, I have taken a keen interest in the Universities; and whenever I have been at a University centre and have had the opportunity, I have visited the University, and made the acquaintance of those who conduct its affairs and instructed myself regarding the work of the University and its influence.

These individual visits have been a source of pleasure and interest to me; and I trust I have been able in my addresses to convey my high conception of the great mission of University teaching and training and my personal conviction of the extreme importance of University work in India in its effect both on the individual and the country as a whole. If by my visits I have communicated in some measure my desire to stimulate and encourage those, who share my ideals for the true scope of University teaching, to look with confidence beyond the local problems and difficulties of the moment confronting the administration of a particular University to the higher and wider planes, which await successful University development, my solicitude has been amply repaid. Many of those here to-day I have had the pleasure of meeting within the walls of their own Universities. It is a pleasure to meet them again and to meet them together; and from this assembling of representatives of various Universities I entertain great expectations. The advantages of collecting representatives together in a Conference may not at first sight be apprehended. It is true that each University is self-contained. It has its own work to perform and the needs of its own centre and clientele to provide for. To a large extent its destiny lies in its own hands and it is master of its own fortunes and alone responsible for its own success or failure. Nevertheless, in the history of a country the more important factor is not the success of an individual University, but the influence and effect of University policy and education as a whole. To take an example from the scheme of Universe, in the world a particular flower may have beauty, colour, scent, perfection of form, or perhaps uses peculiar to itself, but its importance in the general scheme of creation is not comparable with that of the flower world as a whole with its infinite variety of beauty, form, colour, virtues and uses. We might deplore the loss of a single species, but any change affecting the whole flower world would be an unthinkable calamity.

I have stated the fact of my constant interest in Indian Universities; let me explain more precisely the reason for it and for my personal satisfaction in inaugurating this Conference. It may appear that, as education is now a provincial subject, and as the connection of the Government of India or of the Indian Legislature in regard to Universities has only been prescribed in certain particular cases for special reasons, the Governor-General and the Central Government cannot be supposed to be directly interested in their affairs. It is true that University administration is largely now, and rightly, a provincial care; but the abstract idea, which underlies all forms of University activity, is of such cardinal importance that it is woven into the principal functions of the Government of India and the Governor-General. The outcome of the spread of University teaching, if it achieves success and exerts its proper influence, is to set an intellectual and moral standard for the people of India as a whole. It should be the principal formative influence in the development of capacity in these directions. Its highest ideal is not to rest content with the production

of individuals of brilliant attainments, but to ensure a permanent progress in the mental outlook of the people as a whole and to give birth to a higher moral tone in general and to a more widespread striving for enlightenment. The responsibilities of the Government of India for the administration and progress of the country and the charge which has been laid on me as Governor-General by the King-Emperor in his instructions that the "Governor-General should use all endeavour consistent with the fulfilment of his responsibilities to us and our Parliament for the welfare of our Indian subjects" cannot be fulfilled, unless I and my Government take a direct interest in fostering these ideals and in assisting towards their consummation. A healthy national life depends on the wide dissemination of a desire to arrive at balanced judgments, of ideas of duty and discipline and of common responsibilities and mutual obligations. These can only come by the spread of an atmosphere, which it is one of the most important functions of the Universities to diffuse. We have to travel away from the narrow and circumscribed view which regards education only as means of individual advancement or profit, and pass out towards the broader horizon where education is destined to achieve higher purpose to lead the man intellectually endowed and aided by the illuminating quality of imagination to those greater altitudes from which to reflect honour and glory upon his fellowmen and his country. Where these conditions have been established, those who have profited by University teaching will look back on their University days, not merely as an episode serving an individual and material end, but as an epoch in their lives which beckoned along the road of honour and duty.

Let me now turn to the objects which this Conference primarily has in view. In order to appreciate to the full the necessity for this Conference, in addition to the consideration of the importance of fostering common ideals already explained, a brief review of University history in India is essential. University history in India started with the foundation of the Calcutta University in 1857. By 1887 four more Universities had come into existence; and these five institutions continued to exist and cater for the needs of Academic Education in India until 1916. These Universities were all of the affiliating type. This system was well adapted for the first steps; but as the demand for education increased, it outgrew, as is now generally admitted, its usefulness. There was no limit to the number of institutions which could be affiliated to a University; and for the 30 years which elapsed between 1887 and 1916 the increasing demand for University Education was met not by the creation of new Universities but by adding to the number of the affiliated Colleges or inflating their capacity. The strain on the central organisations which were not designed to cope with this unwieldy growth and the weakness of the tie with and between the groups of constituent Colleges, often situated several hundred miles apart and in a position to contribute nothing to the vitality of the University, gradually drained all reserves of strength and

resulted in loss of efficiency. Paralysis seemed imminent which would for ever impair the beneficent activities both of the body itself and of its members.

The Government of India were alive to the danger and broke new ground by advocating a restriction of the area attached to affiliating Universities by the creation of separate Universities for each Province and by the institution of local teaching and residential Universities within each province with a view to secure more progressive educational efficiency. Local patriotism and communal enthusiasm also came to the aid of Government; and to one or other of these various causes may be ascribed the birth of seven new Universities in British India since 1916. A powerful stimulus to University reform and strong support for the establishment of the unitary teaching type of University advocated by the Government of India was also created by the report of the Calcutta University Commission. It is no exaggeration to say that the whole course of University education has been profoundly affected by the publication of this report. No aspect of the functions of a University in India, of the needs for which it should cater or of the conditions essential for its success, escaped the careful survey of this Commission. The highest praise of the labours of the members is to be found in the fact that, though only dealing with the Calcutta University, their conclusions were at once recognised as applicable or adaptable to the whole of India; and not only has all legislation for the incorporation of new Universities since the publication of the Commission's Report embodied features from their recommendations, but some of the older Universities also have in some respects remodelled their structure on lines advocated by them.

We are now at a period in the history of the Universities in India where there has been a sudden increase in the number of Universities. The growth has been phenomenal; in less than a decade the number of Universities has doubled. We are also at a stage where transition from an older to a newer type is in progress; the new Universities are taking different shapes; in addition, apart from changes in external structure, we are living in an era of University reform affecting the internal composition of each edifice. This reform is proceeding, hampered, it is true, in many cases by difficulties of finance, but proceeding nevertheless with a wider horizon of intention and a greater variety of aims than at any past period of University history in India.

I need scarcely point out that at such a time it is essential to ensure the preservation of the highest standards of University education and to safeguard against any falling away from the ideals of the best class of University training. With a multiplication of institutions, with alterations in type, with changes in internal systems, and with financial stringency affecting the complete execution of projects there is no small risk of some deviation from the right road to educational efficiency. It is a time for conserving and strengthening resources and for using them to the best advantage. It is a time when the newer may lean to some extent on the

garnered experience of the older foundations and when the latter may in turn derive some assistance from newer methods under trial in the former. It is a time for mutual help and for co-operation between Universities. A united front must be shown. There must be a joint effort to develop higher education in India to the highest standard. There must be combination to meet reasonable criticism and to remedy defects. Some uniformity of internal organisation seems desirable if there are to be no weak spots in the general system. The work of reorganisation and development lies primarily in the hands of each individual University with the help and control of the Local Government; but the Government of India will always take a profound interest in the progress of the Universities; and it is with the hope of strengthening the structure as a whole and of adding solidarity to the general system that they have initiated this Conference.

The recent advance in the quality and scope of University teaching in India has been remarkable. It should be a source of satisfaction to all those who have laboured to bring it about; and I congratulate them upon the achievement. Nevertheless we should not rest complacently on our laurels. We cannot conceal from ourselves that we have a vast field still to cover. If the highest standards had already been reached, we should not find so many of our brightest students leaving India to complete their education and to seek degrees in England or foreign countries. We must confess to a need for further development in many directions, more especially in higher Technological Education. We are conscious that our Medical Courses have not attained the standard which is elsewhere regarded as the highest. Though India has vast potential resources in the mineral world lying undeveloped, no facilities, I believe, exist at present for the advanced study of Mining Engineering in India and the only School of Mines is still in the stage of being constructed. The higher education of women also is still in its infancy. I have mentioned only a few instances out of many, not in a spirit of reproach because I am fully conscious of the great work that has been accomplished and of the difficulties that have been surmounted in the fields we have already explored, but with a desire to advance the ideal, with which I know you are all in sympathy, of striving to perfect our University education in India and to attain the highest possible standards.

I trust I have now made clear the special needs which my Government hopes may be served by this Conference and the directions in which the results of the Conference may be expected to benefit individual Universities and University education as a whole. If in some degree these expectations can be realised, we shall derive permanent advantages from this first Conference of Indian Universities.

Before I conclude, let me bring to your notice one aspect of the influence of Universities to which I attach the highest importance. I need not lay stress on the great part each University plays in the life of the local or provincial community or on the still more

important part Universities may be expected to play in the life of India as a whole, if by co-operation and mutual assistance between Universities those common ideals and that united strength and solidarity, for which we all hope, can be attained.

If I were to be asked what is the greatest service the Universities can perform for India, I should be in no doubt as to my answer—I should reply “to extend the Empire of reason in India until it is coterminous with the Empire of India itself.” It is a commonplace that one of the effects of University education should be to produce in the individual to a greater or lesser degree according to his capacity the power of forming a balanced judgment by the exercise of reason on a careful examination of ascertained facts. This should be the first characteristic of the scientifically trained and scholarly mind. A mind of this mould will first strive to determine whether the whole of the facts and the whole material necessary for decision have been marshalled for examination. The examination of the material will proceed by testing each component part and assigning to it its correct relative value to the whole. This process can only be successfully carried out by the operation of unbiassed reasoning and by banishing all shadow of prejudice and assumption from the test. In the end the accurate result is only attained by exercise of an untiring capacity for probing each feature of the case and of a passionate desire to find the truth. These are the mental processes which lead up to a reasoned judgment. Difficult as they may appear, they are nevertheless inherent in the powers of the human mind and only need cultivation to secure their growth and expansion. Without such cultivation, the mind is prone to rely excessively upon sentiment, intuition and impulse. Let me examine for a moment these springs of human action. Sentiment may be and indeed often is noble: It is universal; there is no mind so dull, no nature so callous that some spark of sentiment cannot be found in it; but sentiment alone is an unsafe guide to decision. It is too often exercised on an object before reason has time to ascertain whether the object is worthy of its exercise; it is nearly related to prejudice; by itself it is insufficient and unstable ballast for any nation; and by trusting to it alone nations have suffered the ship of state to wreck. To weather the storms and to bring the vessel into safe harbourage sentiment should be controlled and guided by reason. Intuition has its value; but for the individual or the nation it is a mental shortcut which offers no assured return to the highroad. If reason is sufficiently developed, it can reach with certainty that end which intuition may only occasionally attain. Impulse is closely allied to intuition and carries with it the same uncertainty. It is perhaps the commonest of all springs of human action; when not controlled by reason it is surely the most unsafe of all guides. Nevertheless sentiment, intuition and impulse have their bright moments. They do not resemble reason which like the sun shines with a light constant, uniform and lasting; for sentiment, intuition and impulse, although at times a spark of divine afflatus may

inspire them, are meteors, alas, only of uncertain lustre, irregular in motion and delusive in direction. It is a high function of University teaching to provide them with the sure light of the torch of reason, to hand it on from hand to hand until it has illumined the uttermost dark corners of this country and to spread abroad the beams of enlightenment and certainty where the mists of doubt now mask the light.

The Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma thanked His Excellency on behalf of the delegates and the proceedings then terminated.

CHAPTER II.

Proceedings of May the 19th.

After the termination of the inaugural proceedings the delegates assembled in Committee Room B. The Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma, Member of the Governor General's Council for Education, Health and Lands, addressed the delegates. He explained the purpose of the Government of India in summoning the Conference and expressed the hope that the deliberations of the delegates would contribute materially to the solution of the manifold problems attending university education in India. He then outlined the procedure to be adopted in the deliberations of the Conference. [Appendix A (i).]

The universities represented at the Conference proceeded to elect four Committees to consider and report on particular items of the agenda (p. iii) as follows:—

- Committee (i) on item (i) of the agenda;
- Committee (ii) on items (ii) and (xi) of the agenda;
- Committee (iii) on item (iii) of the agenda;
- Committee (iv) on items (iv) and (vi) of the agenda.

It was arranged that the first three Committees should meet on the morning of May the 20th and Committee (iv) on the same afternoon. The committees were composed as follows:—

Committees.

University.	Committee (i).	Committee (ii).	Committee (iii).	Committee (iv).
Calcutta . . .	Dr. W. S. Urquhart	Prof. C. V. Raman	Prof. C. V. Raman	Sir Nilratan Sircar and Principal Maitya.
Bombay . . .	Mr. V. G. Kale . .	Mr. V. G. Kale . .	Mr. V. G. Kale . .	Sir Lalubhai Shah and Mr. V. G. Kale.
Madras . . .	Hon'ble Dr. E. M. Macphail.	Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandrarao.	Hon'ble Mr. Natesan.	Mr. Littlehales and Hon'ble Dr. Macphail.
Punjab . . .	Mr. A. C. Woolner	Mr. Manohar Lal	Prof. S. R. Kashyap.	Khan Bahadur Mian Fazl-i-Hussain and Mr. Manohar Lal.
Allahabad . . .	Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan.	Prof. Burrell . .	Dr. N. R. Dhar . .	Dr. Ganesh Prasad and Dr. N. R. Dhar.
Benares Hindu . .	Mr. A. B. Dhruva	Prof. P. Seshadri	Dr. Bhatnagar . .	Mr. Dhruva and Prof. L. D. Coueslant.
Mysore . . .	Mr. N. S. Subba Rao.	Mr. N. S. Subba Rao.
Patna . . .	Mr. H. Lambert . .	Mr. E. A. Horne . .	Mr. S. N. Sahay . .	Mr. Sultan Ahmad and Mr. S. N. Sahay.
Osmania . . .	Mr. Hydari	Mr. Ross Masood	Mr. Ross Masood	Mr. Hydari and Mr. Ross Masood.
Aligarh Muslim . .	Dr. A. S. Tritton	Dr. L. K. Hyder . .	Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad.	Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad and Dr. L. K. Hyder.
Rangoon	Mr. L. G. Owen	Mr. A. Campbell.

University.	Committee (i).	Committee (ii).	Committee (iii).	Committee (iv).
Lucknow . . .	Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.	Dr. K. N. Bahl .	Dr. K. N. Bahl .	Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji and Dr. K. N. Bahl.
Dacca . . .	Mr. P. J. Hartog .	Dr. J. C. Ghosh .	Dr. J. C. Ghosh .	Mr. P. J. Hartog and Dr. J. C. Ghosh.
Delhi . . .	Mr. Chabiani .	Dr. H. S. Gour .	Mr. Khub Ram .	Dr. H. S. Gour and Mr. Young.
Nagpur . . .	Mr. F. P. Tostevin	Mr. G. G. R. Hunter.	..	Rao Bahadur V. R. Pandit and Mr. F. P. Tostevin.

In the afternoon the Conference reassembled at 2-30 P.M. Sir Narasimha Sarma explained that the proposals of the Lytton Committee on Indian students in England had been circulated to Local Governments and through them to universities for opinion. Mr. Hartog moved the following resolution:—

“ That this Conference considers the substitution of University Students' Information Bureaux for Students' Advisory Committees to be desirable.”

There was a general consensus of opinion in favour of adopting the resolution, but the question whether the universities might club together for the maintenance of these bureaux was raised by Dr. S. A. Khan who stated that in the United Provinces such an arrangement was contemplated in order to avoid expense. He explained that the United Provinces contained four Universities, and if each University were compelled to maintain a bureau, the result would be not one bureau would be really efficient, while the expenditure on their maintenance would be very great indeed. Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary explained that the Lytton Committee had contemplated the establishment of direct relations between individual universities in India and in Great Britain.

After some discussion an amendment adding “ provided that two or more universities may, if they so desire, form a combined bureau ” was suggested and accepted by the proposer of the resolution.

There was further discussion as to whether the University Bureaux should confine themselves to university students strictly so called, or whether they should also concern themselves with other students not connected with the universities.

Rao Bahadur V. R. Pandit moved an amendment to add “ for the purpose of (i) supplying students, whether belonging to the University or not, but belonging to the area over which the University exercises jurisdiction, who wish to pursue their education abroad, with all the information, advice and assistance which they may require; (ii) of supplying foreign university authorities with the kind of information regarding students which will enable them to make their selections from the applications forwarded.”

In moving his amendment Rao Bahadur Pandit explained that in certain provinces intermediate education had been removed from

the control of universities and entrusted to boards. There must be a certain number of brilliant or at any rate deserving students who after completing their intermediate examination might desire to pursue their education abroad. Moreover, there were various competitive examinations held in England for which an age limit has been prescribed. Facilities for preparing for such examinations might be lacking in this country but assistance should be given to students who desired to go to England for preparation at the intermediate stage. The students' advisory committees which it was proposed to abolish catered for the needs of these students also.

After some discussion, the amendment was withdrawn, it having been pointed out that the new bureaux would take over the functions exercised by the present advisory committees of giving advice to any students who applied for such advice. The resolution was unanimously carried in this form:—

“ This Conference considers the substitution of University Students' Information Bureaux for Students' Advisory Committees to be desirable, provided that two or more universities may, if they so desire, form a combined bureau.” (Appendix C. 22.)

The following resolution was then moved by Mr. Hartog and seconded by Mr. Littlehales:—

“ The constitution of the University Students' Information Bureaux is a matter for determination by the Universities and Local Governments concerned.”

An amendment was moved by Dr. Ganesh Prasad and seconded by Principal Maitra to omit the words “ and Local Governments concerned ” and to insert the word “ final ” before “ determination.” Mr. Horne pointed out that as Local Governments would be asked to finance the bureaux they would wish to be consulted as to their constitution. Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary thought that the success of the bureaux might depend upon their being non-official in character as far as possible, but that there would be nothing to prevent officials who were on the university joining the bureaux as university men. This amendment was carried. The resolution was finally passed in the following form:—

“ The constitution of the University Students' Information Bureaux is a matter for final determination by the Universities.” (Appendix C. 23.)

Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad moved that there should be a central agency in India and a central agency in London. In view of the importance of this question the Chairman suggested that it might first be submitted for consideration to Committee number (ii). This was agreed to.

On the motion of Dr. Macphail item (vi) was remitted to Committee number (iv).

The Conference then adjourned till Wednesday, May the 21st, at 10-30 A.M.

CHAPTER III.

Proceedings of May the 20th..

The results of the deliberations of the Committees were presented in the following form:—

Committee (i) assembled at 10-30 A.M. on May the 20th, 1924.

The following members were present:—

Dr. W. S. Urquhart . . .	Calcutta University.
Mr. V. G. Kale . . .	Bombay University.
The Hon'ble Dr. E. M. Macphail	Madras University.
Mr. A. C. Woolner . . .	Punjab University.
Dr. S. A. Khan . . .	Allahabad University.
Mr. A. B. Dhruva . . .	Benares Hindu University.
Mr. N. S. Subba Rao . . .	Mysore University.
Mr. H. Lambert . . .	Patna University.
Mr. A. Hydari . . .	Osmania University.
Dr. A. S. Tritton . . .	Aligarh Muslim University.
Dr. R. K. Mookerji . . .	Lucknow University.
Mr. P. J. Hartog . . .	Dacca University.
Mr. Chablani . . .	Delhi University.
Mr. F. P. Tostevin . . .	Nagpur University.

RESOLUTIONS.

Method of selection of teachers.

(1) That it is desirable that whatever may be the appointing authority teachers should be selected by a small selection committee which in the case of major appointments should contain experts who are not teachers or officers of the university or of the colleges under its jurisdiction.

(2) That such a committee should consist of the Vice-Chancellor and representatives of the executive and academic bodies in addition to the external experts in the case of major appointments.

(3) That it is desirable that the total number of members of such a committee should not ordinarily exceed 9.

Proposer—Dr. E. M. Macphail. Second—Mr. Chablani.

Terms of appointment of teachers.

(4) That it is desirable that in order to secure the best men available university teachers should have security of tenure and

that appointments should be permanent with an age limit of 55 or 60 years; in order, however, to safeguard the interests of the universities such appointments should, except in the case of experienced men who have already gained distinction in their subject, be in the first instance for a term of three years and be subject to confirmation at the end of that period.

Proposer—Mr. Hartog. Second—Dr. Urquhart.

(5) That the foregoing arrangements should not exclude the establishment of short-term appointments in special cases.

Proposer—Mr. Hydari. Second—Dr. S. A. Khan.

Salaries and leave of teachers.

(6) That in view of the disparity of conditions the Conference does not think it either possible or desirable to make any recommendations regarding salaries or leave for university teachers, but they regard it as desirable that this matter should be considered by any permanent inter-university organisation which may be formed.

Proposer—Dr. R. K. Mookerji. Second—Mr. V. G. Kale.

Provident Fund for teachers and officers.

(7) That it is desirable that there should be a provident fund for whole-time permanent teachers and officers of every university, to which the persons concerned and the universities should contribute.

(8) That the contribution of the subscriber should not be less than $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. (one anna in the rupee) and that of the university not less than 10 per cent. of the salary in each case.

Proposer—Mr. A. B. Dhruva. Second—Mr. F. P. Tostevin.

(9) That this Conference recommends, for the favourable consideration of any permanent inter-university organisation which may be established, the foundation of a common provident fund for Indian universities on lines similar to, though not necessarily identical with, those of the Federated Superannuation Fund of the British universities.

Proposer—Mr. P. J. Hartog. Second—Dr. A. S. Tritton.

Exchange of university teachers.

(10) That the Conference approves, in principle the exchange of teachers between different universities, the details being settled in every case by the universities concerned.

(11) That in the opinion of the Conference it is desirable that universities in India should combine to invite distinguished teachers from abroad to deliver courses of lectures at different centres; and that the further consideration of this question be referred to any permanent inter-university organisation that may be founded.

Proposer—Mr. N. S. Subba Rao. Second—Mr. V. G. Kale.

Notice of termination of appointments by university teachers.

(12) That in the opinion of the Conference there should be a mutual understanding between universities to the effect that whole-time university teachers should not ordinarily be at liberty to determine their appointments without giving six months' notice.

Proposer—Mr. A. C. Woolner. Seconder—Mr. Chablani.

E. MONTEITH MACPHAIL,
Chairman.

Committee (ii) assembled at 10-30 A.M. on May the 20th, 1924.

The following members were present:—

Professor C. V. Raman	. . .	Calcutta University.
M. Ramachandrarao, Diwan Bahadur	. . .	Madras University.
Mr. Manohar Lal	. . .	Punjab University.
Professor P. S. Burrell	. . .	Allahabad University.
Professor P. Seshadri	. . .	Benares Hindu University.
Mr. E. A. Horne	. . .	Patna University.
Mr. Ross Masood	. . .	Osmania University.
Dr. L. K. Hyder	. . .	Aligarh Muslim University.
Mr. L. G. Owen	. . .	Rangoon University.
Dr. K. N. Bahl	. . .	Lucknow University.
Dr. J. C. Ghosh	. . .	Dacca University.
Dr. H. S. Gour	. . .	Delhi University.
Mr. G. G. R. Hunter	. . .	Nagpur University.

Dr. H. S. Gour was elected to the chair and Professor P. Seshadri, Secretary to the Committee.

With reference to item (xi) proposal to form some permanent inter-university organisation, the following resolutions were passed:—

I. That it is necessary to have a central agency in India—

- (a) to act as an inter-university organisation and bureau of information:
- (b) to facilitate the exchange of professors and students:
- (c) to assist in the co-ordination of university work and the promotion of specialisation of functions:

- (d) to assist Indian universities in obtaining recognition for their degrees, diplomas and examinations in other countries:
- (e) to appoint or recommend, where necessary, a common representative or representatives of India at Imperial or international conferences on higher education:
- (f) to act as a bureau for appointments in Indian universities.

II. That the central agency be constituted as follows:—

- (1) The Board should consist of one representative appointed by each university.
- (2) The members will hold office for three years.
- (3) The Government of India may nominate from time to time a representative to attend meetings of the Board in an advisory capacity.
- (4) The headquarters of the Board should be at the capital of India, but the Board should meet at such centres as may be decided by the Board from time to time (Professor C. V. Raman, Dr. J. C. Ghosh and Diwan Bahadur Ramaehandrarao dissenting).
- (5) Half the cost of the maintenance of the Board should be met by the Government of India and the other half by equal contributions from the universities.
- (6) The Committee estimates that the annual cost of the maintenance of the central office of the Board is not likely to exceed Rs. 30,000 for the next few years, excluding the travelling allowances of members.
- (7) The Committee expects universities to pay the travelling expenses of their own representatives.

III. That the Government of India be requested to intimate to the International Committee of the League of Nations on Intellectual Co-operation that the proposed inter-university organisation should be recognised as an institution which the International Committee should consult with a view to the formation of an Indian National Committee.

With regard to item (ii) the following resolutions were passed:—

- I. The Committee recommends that universities should facilitate the issue of books to professors of other universities under such safeguards as may be necessary.

- II. The Committee does not think it practicable to make any recommendation with regard to the exchange and gift of books among Indian universities.
- III. The Committee recommends that the India Office, the Government of India and the Provincial Governments should supply all their publications free of cost to each university in India.
- IV. The Committee recommends that the libraries of the Imperial Government should be accessible wherever possible to professors of Indian universities.

With regard to item (x) (a) and (b) the following resolutions were passed:—

- I. That it be recommended to the Government of India, that with a view to promote co-operation among Indian universities in higher scientific studies and research and to advise the Government of India from time to time generally with regard to the promotion of scientific research in India, a central advisory board for scientific research be constituted in India comprising the heads of scientific Departments of the Government of India and a representative of science nominated by each of the Indian universities.
- II. The Committee is of opinion that economy in university finances and increase of efficiency will be rendered possible by the co-ordination of post-graduate studies in Indian universities, especially in provinces containing more than one university. (Professor C. V. Raman, Dr. J. C. Ghosh, Diwan Bahadur Ramachandrarao, Dr. L. K. Hyder and Dr. K. N. Bahl desired their dissent to this resolution to be recorded.)

The Committee then adjourned for lunch and resolved to meet at 2-45 P.M.

P. SESHADRI,
Secretary.

H. S. GOUR,
Chairman.

Committee (ii) reassembled at 2-45 P.M.

PRESENT.

Dr. H. S. Gour (in the Chair).
 Professor Q. V. Raman.
 Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandrarao.
 Professor P. S. Burrell,
 Mr. E. A. Horne.
 Mr. L. G. Owen.
 Mr. G. G. R. Hunter.
 Professor P. Seshadri (*Secretary*).

Mr. J. W. Bhore, I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Education, Health and Lands, was also present by special invitation.

The following resolutions were passed with regard to the second part of item (v) :—

I. That the proposed Indian Universities' Bureaux may continue to use the existing organisation in England which might in future be termed the Education Department of the High Commissioner's Office.

II. The question of forming a separate central agency in England for Indian Universities be deferred till further experience has been gained of the working of the proposed University Bureaux.

The Chairman nominated the following members of the Committee to move the various resolutions to be put before the general Conference :—

First set of propositions relating to the functions of the Inter-University Board—to be moved by Dr. Gour. Second set of propositions with regard to the constitution of the Board—to be moved by Mr. Horne. Third proposition with regard to co-operation with the International League—Mr. Hunter. Propositions with regard to item (ii)—Professor Seshadri. First proposition with regard to items (a) and (b) of item (vi) about the constitution of a central advisory board for scientific research in India—Professor Raman. Second proposition with regard to (a) and (b) of item (vi) on the co-ordination of post-graduate studies in Indian Universities—Professor P. S. Burrell. Proposition no. I with regard to the second part of item (v)—Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandrarao. Second proposition with regard to the second part of item (v)—Mr. Hunter.

The meeting dispersed with a vote of thanks to the Chair and to the Secretary proposed by Professor Burrell.

P. SESHADRI,
Secretary,

H. S. GOUR,
Chairman.

Committee (iii) assembled at 10-30 A.M.

The following members were present:—

Professor S. R. Kashyap	
(Chairman)	Punjab University.
Professor C. V. Raman	Calcutta University.
Hon'ble Mr. G. A. Natesan	Madras University.
Dr. N. R. Dhar	Allahabad University.
Dr. S. S. Bhatnagar	Benares Hindu University.
Mr. S. N. Sahay	Patna University.
Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad	Aligarh Muslim University.
Dr. K. N. Bahl	Lucknow University.
Mr. Khub Ram	Delhi University.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted.

1. This Committee is of opinion that it is not desirable to have a single Journal of Science for the whole of India but that there should be All-India Journals dealing with special branches of knowledge.

(To be moved by the Hon'ble Mr. Natesan, and seconded by Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad.)

2. This Committee considers it desirable that the Journals of the Indian Botanical Society and of the Indian Chemical Society, which are already in existence and which are run on an All-India inter-university basis, should be encouraged and supported by the Government and the universities.

(To be moved by Dr. N. R. Dhar, and seconded by Dr. Bhatnagar.)

3. This Committee is of opinion that the Records of the Indian Museum (A Journal of Indian Zoology), the Records of the Botanical Survey of India, Memoirs of the Geological Survey of India and the Agricultural Journal of India, now run by Government, should have on their Editorial Boards expert representatives of the various universities and that the scope of these journals should be enlarged.

(To be moved by Dr. K. N. Bahl, and seconded by Mr. S. N. Sahay.)

4. This Committee considers it desirable that the Indian Science Congress be requested to make efforts to start a combined Journal for Physics and Mathematics on an All-India basis on the lines of the Journals of the Indian Botanical Society and the Indian Chemical Society and that the Government and the universities be requested to encourage and support the same.

(To be moved by Mr. Khub Ram, and seconded by Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad.)

5. This Committee considers it desirable that the Government of India should organise the publication of a scientific journal dealing with the sciences for which specific provision is not otherwise made.

(To be moved by Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad, and seconded by Mr. Khub Ram.)

SHIV RAM KASHYAP,

Chairman.

Committee (iv) met at 2-30 P.M. on May the 20th, 1924.

Mr. A. Hydari (Chairman)	Osmania University.
Sir Nilratan Sircar	Calcutta University.
Principal H. C. Maitra	Calcutta University.
Sir Lalubhai Shah	Bombay University.
Mr. V. G. Kale	Bombay University.
Mr. R. Littlehales	Madras University.
The Hon'ble Dr. E. M. Macphail	Madras University.
Khan Bahadur Mian Fazl-i-Hussain	Punjab University.
Mr. Manohar Lal	Punjab University.
Dr. Ganesh Prasad	Allahabad University.
Dr. N. R. Dhar	Allahabad University.
Mr. A. B. Dhruva	Benares Hindu University.
Mr. L. D. Coueslant	Benares Hindu University.
Mr. N. S. Subba Rao	Mysore University.
Mr. Sultan Ahmad	Patna University.
Mr. S. N. Sahay	Patna University.
Mr. Ross Masood	Osmania University.
Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad	Aligarh Muslim University.
Dr. L. K. Hyder	Aligarh Muslim University.
Mr. A. Campbell	Rangoon University.
Dr. R. K. Mookerji	Lucknow University.
Dr. K. N. Bahl	Lucknow University.
Mr. P. J. Hartog	Dacca University.
Dr. J. C. Ghosh	Dacca University.
Dr. H. S. Gour	Delhi University.
Mr. P. N. F. Young	Delhi University.
Rao Bahadur V. R. Pandit	Nagpur University.
Mr. F. P. Tostevin	Nagpur University.

The following resolutions were passed:—

- (1) “ That it be recommended to the Conference that mutual recognition of degrees and examinations by Indian Universities be encouraged.”

(To be moved by Mr. Dhruva.)

- (2) “ That this Conference recommends that candidates appearing for the post-graduate, M.A. or M.Sc. degree examination at an Indian University be allowed credit for the attendance and work at another university, provided that at least one academical year has been spent at the university at which the degree is taken.”

(To be moved by Mr. N. S. Subba Rao.)

The following resolution was moved by Mr. N. S. Subba Rao, but it was decided on the score of the lateness of the hour that the matter should be taken up at the main Conference:—

“ That this Conference is of opinion that the new regulations of affiliation of the Cambridge and Oxford Universities are less favourable to Indian students than those in force hitherto, and recommends that—

- (1) The authorities of the Cambridge and Oxford Universities be moved to accept, for purposes of affiliation, Indian degrees which require the study of *one* language, in addition to English, that language being—

(a) Sanskrit, Pali, Arabic, or Persian in the case of affiliation to the Cambridge University.

(b) Sanskrit, Pali, Arabic, Persian, French or German (or an Indian vernacular) in the case of affiliation to the Oxford University.

- (2) That the authorities of the Cambridge University be moved to grant graduates of an Indian University who have not obtained first or second class honours the status and privileges granted to them by the Oxford University, *viz.*, those of a junior student.”

CHAPTER IV.

Proceedings of May the 21st.

The Conference resumed its session at 10-30 A.M. under the presidency of the Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma.

Colonel R. J. Collins, C.M.G., D.S.O., and Colonel J. C. Freeland representing the Army Department were present.

The first item which came up for discussion was the recognition of the final examination of the Prince of Wales' College, Dehra Dun, as equivalent to the Intermediate Examination.

Colonel Collins explained the point of view of the military authorities and the curriculum of the Prince of Wales' College, and stated that it was hoped that for the majority of cadets a Sandhurst career would be available. But the military authorities were anxious that students who for medical or other reasons were unable to proceed to Sandhurst should not be handicapped in the search for other careers. It was for such students, whose numbers must necessarily increase with the increase in the number of students on the roll, that some recognition by the universities of the diploma of the Prince of Wales' College, Dehra Dun, was asked for.

The Chairman explained that the principal object of placing this item on the agenda was to open up the subject and to place the authorities at Dehra Dun in touch with the university bodies. A general discussion took place. Several speakers pointed out that it was difficult to decide upon the equivalence of examinations, without a detailed scrutiny of the Dehra Dun syllabus. The general sense of the Conference was one of sympathy and desire to assist the military authorities in solving the problem of the careers of those cadets who failed to qualify for the Army. The suggestion was made that "military training" at Dehra Dun should count as one of the subjects for the purpose of equivalence with the Intermediate Examination. It was pointed out that the question of equivalence was one that could only be finally decided by individual universities.

The Conference then proceeded to examine the question of admitting students of Indian universities to direct King's Commissions on the system adopted at Oxford and Cambridge.

Dr. Ganesh Prasad urged that the Conference should record its strong opinion that Government should admit students of Indian universities to direct King's Commissions on the Oxford and Cambridge principle. Colonel Collins explained that King's Commissions were only given to university students on the direct recommendation

of the Army Council, and said that it was very doubtful if this power could be delegated. He felt sure that the best preparation for Indian officers was through the Prince of Wales' College; where particular care was directed towards building up the stamina necessary for the arduous duties of military life. Dr. Gour proposed that the Conference should pass a resolution asking Government to establish university corps in all universities with the idea of fostering direct recruitment for King's Commissions in the Indian Army from among Indian University graduates.

The President suggested that their purpose would be served if the fact were recorded that the Conference was by a majority of opinion that the university authorities would gladly co-operate with the Governmental authorities in any scheme that might be instituted for direct recruitment on the lines adopted in the British universities.

Mr. Campbell suggested that the military authorities might be asked to institute examinations equivalent to those for the certificates A and B of the Officers Training Corps in England, as a first step towards the institution of University Commissions.

After some further discussion the President's suggestion was accepted, and the majority opinion of the Conference was recorded as stated above.

University Training Corps. The Conference then passed on to the (Item vii.) question of University Training Corps.

Mr. Woolner explained some of the practical difficulties attending the task of finding time for military training in the short cold weather season consistently with the claims of academic work. There were also certain difficulties connected with discipline. Short of very drastic penalties, the Commander had really no power save reprimand. The college authorities in some cases were willing to co-operate by bringing college discipline to bear. He enquired what was being done elsewhere. He also dealt with the exceptional cases of men who took very readily to the training and wanted to join the regular army. It would be an excellent thing if some direct avenues were provided for these men.

Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad described the keenness of the Aligarh students, but deplored delays and the poor response on the part of the Government in the matter of equipment.

Dr. Bahl stated that in the United Provinces instead of 16 platoons there were only 8. Uniforms and equipment were delayed. Rifles had been promised but not issued. No annual camps had so far been held, despite repeated requests. Mr. Dhruva also joined in the complaint on behalf of the Benares Hindu University.

Mr. Hartog said that the experience of Dacca was even less favourable than elsewhere. No final answer had been received to the request made more than a year ago for the establishment of a university corps despite repeated reminders.

Mr. Littlehailes stated that from Madras there were no grievances. There was a very general interest among the public; without this, the university itself could hardly have got things going. They had difficulties in getting officers for the platoons: and they had also some difficulty in the matter of discipline, due to the sensitive character of the Indian student. They had found it best to go gently at first, and to establish discipline through *esprit de corps*.

Mr. Sultan Ahmad stated that Patna was doing well; and had no grounds for complaint either against the students or the military authorities. He suggested that the universities should recognise the military training of cadets as a subject for university purposes.

Dr. Hyder complained of insufficient response on the part of the military authorities.

Mr. Campbell proposed that this Conference recommends to the military authorities:—

- “(1) the institution of A and B certificates in University Training Corps and the overhauling of the system of granting commissions in the University Training Corps;
- “(2) that a central information body be set up to co-ordinate and bring into touch the University Training Corps in various places;
- “(3) that the military authorities add to their subventions for the purpose of training camps, etc., and that the universities should supplement these funds.”

He also recommended:—

- “(4) that some effort should be made to ensure closer working between the University Training Corps and the battalions of the Territorial Force;
- “(5) that sapper and medical units should be encouraged;
- “(6) that Anglo-Indians should be permitted to enter the University Training Corps;
- “(7) that universities should take the holding of A and B certificates into account in estimating the work of students in examinations;
- “(8) that the military authorities should hold out facilities to the University Training Corps to take part in inter-army rifle meetings and the like.”

Dr. Ganesh Prasad pointed out some difficulties in recognising military training as part of the degree course. Professor Burrell emphasised this point. Sir D. P. Sarvadhikary and Dr. Gour on the other hand supported the principle that the universities should directly encourage University Training Corps by recognising military training in their courses.

Colonel Freeland explained certain points regarding training camps, discipline and the like. He would be willing to take up the

question of the disciplinary powers of the Commanding Officers, if practical suggestions were put up to him; but this particular difficulty had not been represented to him before. The A and B certificates might, he thought, help towards direct Viceroy's Commissions and the military authorities would consider the institution of such certificates sympathetically. One difficulty about the University Training Corps was the limitation of the total Territorial Force strength to 20,000; and though he was a firm believer in the University Training Corps on educational grounds, it must be remembered that it was of no military value. He then dealt with various matters affecting individual universities.

The resolutions proposed by Mr. Campbell were passed *nem. con.* with the exception of no. 7 upon which a vote was taken. This was carried by 22 votes to 10. (Appendix C. 26—34.)

Modern languages in University curricula.

The Conference then passed on to item (x). Mr. Dhruva moved:—

“ That this Conference is of opinion (a) that composition in a modern Indian language be prescribed as a compulsory subject at the Matriculation or Admission examination, the Intermediate examinations in Arts and Science and the B.A. and B.Sc. examinations;

“ (b) that a modern Indian language and literature be recognised as an optional subject at the Intermediate Arts and Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts examinations.”

In the course of his remarks the mover pointed out how the education of Indian youths remained barren for want of sufficient command over their mother tongue. Moreover, the Indian vernaculars, he said, provided a rich field for linguistic and literary research, and were thus a fit subject for university recognition and encouragement.

Dr. Macphail moved to omit the prescription in the case of the B.A. and B.Sc. as he thought that a student should be at liberty to choose his own subjects of study for his degree. The amendment was carried, and both parts of the motion as amended were carried. (Appendix C. 35.)

Dr. J. C. Ghosh moved that “ in the interests of those students taking an Honours or Post-Graduate degree in Science, facilities should be provided by Indian universities for the study of French and German.” The motion was seconded by Professor C. V. Raman. Principal Maitra moved as an amendment that the words “ or arts ” should be inserted after the word “ science.” The amendment was carried.

Mr. Hunter moved that the word “ Russian ” be inserted after the word “ French ” in view of the recent contribution of Russia to political and economic theory and of the proximity of Russia to India. The amendment was not seconded.

The original resolution of Dr. Ghosh as amended was carried *nem. con.* (Appendix C. 36.)

The Conference then adjourned for lunch.

The Conference resumed its session at 2-30 P.M. and proceeded to discuss the recommendations of Committee number (2).

Appointment of University Teachers. Dr. Macphail moved and Mr. Chabiani seconded the following resolutions:—

“ That it is desirable that whatever may be the appointing authority teachers should be selected by a small selection committee which in the case of major appointments should contain experts who are not teachers or officers of the university or of the colleges under its jurisdiction.

“ That such committee should consist of the Vice-Chancellor and representatives of the executive and academic bodies in addition to external experts in the case of major appointments.

“ That it is desirable that the total number of members of such a committee should not ordinarily exceed nine.”

These were carried unanimously. (Appendix C. 1—3.)

Mr. Hartog moved and Dr. Urquhart seconded the following resolution:—

“ That it is desirable that in order to secure the best men available, university teachers should have security of tenure and that appointments should be permanent, with an age limit of 55 or 60 years; in order however to safeguard the interests of the universities, such appointments should, except in the case of experienced men who have already gained distinction in their subject, be in the first instance for a term of three years and be subject to confirmation at the end of that period.”

Mr. Hartog pointed out that in India the universities competed with Government service in which there was practically security of tenure and unless some similar security of tenure were provided by the universities, Government would always have the best men and the universities the second best. On the other hand, Committee number (2) were of opinion that permanency of appointment should not be given to young men until they had proved that they were adequate to the posts to which they were appointed, and they recommended, therefore, that all appointments should be made, in the first instance, for a term of three years only, and be subject to confirmation at the end of that period, except in the case of men who had already gained distinction* in the subject of the appointment—men whom it would not be possible to secure in many instances, unless they were offered such security of tenure at the outset. The proposals made by the Committee were on the lines adopted by the University of London.

* (Distinction in a subject was not intended to mean distinction obtained at examinations.)

The resolution was carried. (Appendix C. 4.)

Mr. Hydari moved and Dr. S. A. Khan seconded:—

“ That the foregoing arrangements should not exclude the establishment of short-term appointments in special cases.”

This was carried. (Appendix C. 5.)

Mr. Owen moved:—

“ That it is desirable that university teachers be exempted from language tests, except when such tests have a direct bearing on the work for which they have been appointed.”

Mr. Owen quoted the case of a valuable professor who had failed three times to pass in Burmese. Professor Raman seconded the resolution, which was carried. (Appendix C. 7.)

Dr. R. K. Mookerji moved and Mr. V. G. Kale seconded:—

“ That in view of the disparity of conditions the Conference does not think that it is either possible or desirable to make any recommendations regarding salary or leave for university teachers, but it regards it as desirable that this matter should be considered by any permanent inter-university organisation which may be formed.”

In moving the resolution Dr. Mookerji pointed out the disparity of conditions and resources of different universities which stood in the way of any uniform treatment or simple solution of the problems indicated. He instanced, in particular, the munificent endowments offered to the Calcutta University by the late Sir Rashbehari Ghose and Sir Taraknath Palit under which university professorships carrying different salaries ranging from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000 and upwards were created. It would be premature in the present stage of university development in India to try to fix any rigid and absolute minimum of salary for the title and status of a university professor or reader. The autonomy of the universities which differ so much as regards their local conditions, traditions, resources, and even their difficulties and prospects should be left untouched in this matter. Even at Oxford or Cambridge university chairs created by endowments have different salaries depending on the amount of the endowments. According to indigenous educational ideals of India, the status and the honour due to a teacher should not depend upon his pay alone. There are some prominent institutions which are endeavouring to organise the available moral resources of the country—the spirit of self-sacrifice and enthusiasm for public service—for the promotion of education, and such endeavours should be given full scope.

Principal Maitra moved the omission of words “ but they regard it as desirable that this matter should be considered by any permanent inter-university organisation which may be formed.” After

discussion the amendment was lost and the original motion carried. (Appendix C. 8.)

Mr. Woolner moved and Mr. Hartog seconded:—

“That in the opinion of the Conference there should be a mutual understanding between universities to the effect that whole-time university teachers should not ordinarily be at liberty to determine their appointments without giving six months’ notice.”

The resolution was carried. (Appendix C. 6.)

Mr. Dhruva moved and Mr. Tostevin seconded:—

Provident Funds.

“That it is desirable that there should be a provident fund for whole-time permanent teachers and officers of every university to which the persons concerned and the universities should contribute.”

“That it is desirable that the contribution of the subscriber should not be less than $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. (one anna in the rupee) and that of the University not less than 10 per cent. of the salary in each case.”

The mover characterised the subject of his motion as a beneficent measure, absolutely necessary in order to ensure that atmosphere of freedom from anxiety which was essential for good educational work.

These resolutions were both carried. (Appendix C. 9—10.)

Mr. Hartog moved and Dr. Tritton seconded:—

“That the Conference recommends for the favourable consideration of any permanent inter-university organisation which may be established the foundation of a common provident fund for Indian universities on lines similar to, though not necessarily identical with, those of the Federated Superannuation Fund of the British universities.”

Mr. Hartog explained that some years ago the Government in England, with the concurrence of the universities, had framed a superannuation scheme which all universities were at liberty to join and which had been joined by the majority of the British universities. He had not the available details of the scheme but the general provisions were somewhat as follows:—For all persons whose lives were insurable an endowment insurance was taken out by the University concerned for each beneficiary. Towards the cost of this insurance the universities originally contributed 5 per cent., and each beneficiary 5 per cent. of his salary. The sum produced was, however, found to be insufficient and some years ago the contribution of the universities was raised to 10 per cent. which is the figure now adopted.

When a teacher left one of the universities belonging to the scheme to go to another university, the second university took over the responsibility originally taken by the first university and thus the transference of the teacher from one of the universities to another was effected without loss in respect of the life insurance scheme, either to the university or to the teacher. Migration of teachers from one university to another was common in England, it being the ordinary practice for the higher posts in a university to be filled by teachers who had achieved distinction in another university, generally in a post of less importance.

Special provision was made in the scheme for persons whose lives were not insurable.

The speaker thought that the English scheme would need careful study in order to make it adaptable to Indian conditions, but Committee number (2) and he believed that it would be of very great advantage to India if a common scheme could be adopted which would allow the migration of teachers from one university to another without affecting provident fund arrangements.

The resolution was carried. (Appendix C. 11.)

Professor Seshadri moved and Mr. Hartog seconded:—

“That the Government of India be requested to apply the provisions of the Provident Funds Act of 1897 to the Provident Funds of Indian universities established by the Legislature and exempt contribution so made to them from payment of income-tax.”

Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad and Dr. Macphail also supported, the latter hoping that provident funds attached to affiliated colleges might also enjoy the privilege at an early date.

This resolution was carried. (Appendix C. 12.)

Mr. Subba Rao moved and Mr. V. G. Kale seconded:—

Exchange of Professors.

“That this Conference approves on principle the exchange of teachers between different universities, the details being settled in every case by the universities concerned.”

Mr. Subba Rao said that the principle underlying the resolution had been accepted not only by all the universities in India with which the Mysore University had corresponded on the subject, but also by important bodies abroad. The League of Nations Committee for Intellectual Co-operation recommended that “each of the National Committees is to endeavour in its own country to encourage as much as possible the development of the system of interchange among professors and lecturers, not only for short series of lectures but also for courses of lecturing and practical teaching of longer duration.” It was also well known that the Carnegie Endowment subsidised exchange of professors among the universities of the United States and even between different countries. For example,

recently a professor of the Baroda College had gone to Nebraska and the Nebraska professor had come to Baroda.

The resolution was carried. (Appendix C. 13.)

External lecturers. • Mr. Subba Rao then moved and Mr. Kale seconded:—

“That in the opinion of the Conference it is desirable that universities in India should combine to invite distinguished teachers from abroad to deliver courses of lectures at different centres; and that the further consideration of this question be referred to any permanent inter-university organisation that may be founded.”

Mr. Subba Rao said it was most desirable in the interests of economy that several Indian universities should arrange jointly for the visits of distinguished teachers from abroad, as thereby they could share the heavy travelling expenses. Such visits could also be arranged on some system, so as to give the benefit of such visits to a number of universities.

This resolution was carried. (Appendix C. 14.)

The Conference then passed on to consider the report of Committee number (ii).

Inter-borrowing of books and manuscripts. Professor Seshadri moved and Diwan Bahadur Ramachandrarao seconded the following resolutions which were all passed:—

- (i) “That universities should facilitate the issue of books and manuscripts to professors of other universities under such safeguards as may be necessary, though it is not practicable to make any recommendation with regard to the exchange and gift of books among Indian universities.” (Appendix C. 15.)
- (ii) “That the India Office, the Government of India and the provincial governments should supply copies of all their publications free of cost to each university in India.” (Appendix C. 16.)
- (iii) “That the libraries of the Imperial Government should be accessible, where possible, to professors of Indian universities.” (Appendix C. 17.)

CHAPTER V.

Proceedings of May the 21st (concluded) and of May the 22nd.

Inter-University Board. Dr. Gour moved and Diwan Bahadur
(Item xi.) Ramachandrarao seconded—

“That it is necessary to have a central agency in India—

- “(a) to act as an inter-university organisation and a bureau of information;
- “(b) to facilitate the exchange of professors and students;
- “(c) to assist in the co-ordination of university work and the promotion of specialisation of functions;
- “(d) to assist Indian universities in obtaining recognition for their degrees, diplomas and examinations in other countries;
- “(e) to appoint or recommend, where necessary, a common representative or representatives of India at Imperial or international conferences on higher education;
- “(f) to act as a bureau of appointments in Indian universities.”

The discussion on this resolution was taken clause by clause.

To clause (a) Dr. Ganesh Prasad moved an amendment to add the words “which should be of a purely advisory character.” Dr. Gour explained that such was in fact the intention of the resolution he had moved. Mr. Hartog pointed out that the adoption of Dr. Ganesh Prasad’s amendment would deprive universities of the power to use the board as an agency if they wished to do so. Sir John Maynard suggested that the object of the mover of the amendment would be met by the addition of the phrase “which should be of an advisory and ministerial character.” Dr. Ganesh Prasad was prepared to accept this amendment, but the majority of delegates did not feel the need for such a qualifying phrase as the functions of the Board were sufficiently detailed in the succeeding clauses and the original resolution namely “it is necessary to have a central agency in India (a) to act as an inter-university organisation and bureau of information” was carried.

From clause (b) Dr. Macphail moved for the omission of the words “and students” as these words appeared to encourage the migration of under-graduate students from one university to another which was not desirable. The amendment was seconded by Mr. Littlehales and accepted *nem con*.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya moved that the whole of clause (b) should be omitted. He said that each university best knew what help it would welcome from another university, and also which of

its professors it could send out on deputation. Two universities could therefore best decide the question of an exchange of professors, and the terms and conditions upon which they could do so, by direct correspondence with each other. It was not necessary—it would only cause delay—if the proposals had to pass through a central agency. In support of Dr. Gour's motion it was pointed out that the resolution only used the word "facilitate" and that it would not be incumbent on any university to employ the services of the Board for this purpose unless it desired to do so. This amendment was rejected by a majority and the resolution as amended by Dr. Macphail was passed. The Conference then adjourned.

The Conference resumed its session at 10-30 A.M. on May, the 22nd, the Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma in the Chair. The consideration of Dr. Gour's resolution regarding the functions of the Inter-University Board was resumed at clause (c) which ran:—

"to assist in the co-ordination of university work and the promotion of specialisation of functions."

Dr. Ganesh Prasad moved that for the words "to assist in" the following words be substituted "to serve as an authorised channel of communication between universities for" and that the second part of the clause, *i.e.*, "and the promotion of specialisation of functions" be omitted. The two parts of this amendment were discussed separately.

Against the first part of the amendment it was argued by Rai Bahadur V. R. Pandit and others that its acceptance would reduce the functions of the Board to that of a post office, and that so far from assisting universities it would only serve to delay inter-communication. At the same time it was felt by several speakers that the words "to assist in" left the powers and duties of the Board too vague. An amendment was moved by Dr. Urquhart to substitute the following words "to serve as an authorised channel of communication and to facilitate the co-ordination of university work." This amendment was carried *nem con.*

The omission of the words "and the promotion of specialisation of functions" was supported by Professor Raman and by Mr. Hartog, the latter of whom pointed out that their inclusion in the resolution suggested an intention to inhibit universities from developing to their fullest capacity. Mr. Hartog said that specialisation would be best achieved by the distribution of grants from a central body to encourage development on individual lines and not by any system of inhibition.

Dr. R. K. Mookerji was also in favour of the omission of these words and read out an extract from the Report of the Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities, presided over by Mr. Asquith, to show how the principle was therein recognised that the universities should be self-contained as centres of learning, cultivating equally the humanities and the sciences in the interests of culture itself. The position was accordingly taken that Oxford

should lead as much in the sciences as the equal of Cambridge as she has done in the humanities.

Dr. S. A. Khan while giving his cordial support to the principle enunciated in the resolution, warned the Conference against the possibility of the misuse of the term "co-ordination," and "specialisation." He recognised the need for specialisation, but showed that "co-ordination," if not clearly defined may—he did not say, it is bound to—lead to retrenchment of expenditure on universities. "Co-ordination" might come to mean a cutting down of expenditure on the maintenance of university chairs, and research scholarships. He, however, supported the resolution, as he was aware that the resources of some of the universities were frittered away on the maintenance of professorships and readerships in subjects for which there was no real demand.

The amendment to omit these words was carried by a majority.

Clause (d) "to assist Indian universities in obtaining recognition for their degrees, diplomas and examinations in other countries" was passed without discussion.

For clause (e) "to appoint or recommend, where necessary, a common representative or representatives of India at Imperial or international conferences on higher education," Dr. Ganesh Prasad moved that the following words be substituted "to assist the universities in the election of a common representative or representatives of India whenever there is occasion for such election." The practical difficulties involved in the acceptance of this alternative were pointed out by several speakers. If each university suggested different representatives how was the election to be carried out. Dr. Macphail also pointed out that the term "university" used in this connection was difficult to define. Were the syndicates or the senates to elect representatives? The Universities would already have elected their representatives on the Central Board and this was surely a function with which the Board could be entrusted. Mr. Hydari pointed out that as the function of the Board would be only a recommendatory one, the proper course would be for all the names suggested by the Universities to be sent up to the Government of India who would select one from them. As to this it was pointed out that this could be provided for in the rules of the Board which it would make for the purpose.

The original motion was accepted.

For (f) "to act as a bureau of appointments in Indian universities" Mr. Hartog suggested the substitution of the words "to act as an appointments bureau for Indian universities" as he contemplated that the Central Board would be used as an agency for finding appointments for distinguished Indian graduates. To this it was objected that each university should have its own appointments bureau to find work for its own graduates. Mr. Woolner stated that the Punjab University already possessed such a bureau.

Dr. Ganesh Prasad moved to substitute the words "to act as a bureau of information for appointments in Indian universities."

It was objected that this was an unnecessary elaboration of the original phrase as the function of an appointments bureau was merely to bring employers and candidates into touch with each other. Mr. Horne pointed out that the recommendation of the Committee confined its functions to acting as a Bureau of Information for appointments in Indian universities only, whereas Mr. Hartog's amendment extended it not only to such appointments, but to appointments in general.

Mr. Hydari objected to the amendment on the ground that there was a fear of graduates of all the universities not receiving that consideration for particular appointments from a Joint Board as they would from their own University individually and that it would be therefore desirable to confine the activities of the bureau only to university appointments so that it might not act as an ancillary to a Public Service Commission Board.

In favour of Mr. Hartog's amendment it was argued that while the Central Board would not deal with ordinary university graduates who would be referred to their local university appointments bureau it might be able to find posts outside universities for graduates of eminent distinction. The amendment of Dr. Ganesh Prasad was negatived and that of Mr. Hartog accepted.

Various subsidiary amendments to add further duties to the Board were withdrawn in favour of a general amendment moved by Mr. Hartog, adding (g) "to fulfil such other duties as may be assigned to it from time to time by the Indian universities." (Appendix C. 37.)

Mr. Horne moved the next recommendation of the committee:—

"That the Board should consist of one representative appointed by each university."

Sir Lalubhai Shah moved an amendment "that the Board should consist of one representative appointed by each unitary university and two representatives appointed by each of the other statutory universities." He thought that the more complex interests of the older universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras would require more representation.

This view was supported by Sir Nilratan Sircar.

It was shown that the wording of the resolution was defective in that it would give two representatives to every affiliating university including the most recent and smallest universities. The delegates of Patna and Nagpur expressed their willingness to forego the additional representation offered to them by the amendment. Dr. Macphail said that however wide the interests of the Madras University were, its delegates were in favour of equal representation for all universities. He quoted the examples of the United States, the Swiss Confederacy and the League of Nations Assembly where no difference in representation was made between the larger and the smaller states. Professor P. Seshadri also opposed the resolution on

the ground that such inequality of representation would introduce an element of disharmony injurious to the work of the proposed Board. After some discussion the proposition was lost only seven delegates voting in its favour and the original motion was adopted. [Appendix C. 38 (i).]

For the next proposition: "that the members shall hold office for three years," Dr. Urquhart moved the substitution of the following words:—"members shall ordinarily hold office for three years, but during the first triennial period one-third of the original members shall retire at the end of one year, and one-third at the end of the second year, the allocation to be made by lot." He explained that the object of his amendment was to maintain some continuity in the personnel of the Board. The amendment was agreed to *nem con.* [Appendix C. 38 (ii).]

For the proposition "the Government of India may nominate from time to time a representative to attend meetings of the Board in an advisory capacity," alternative amendments were moved by Mr. Tostevin, Dr. Gour and Dr. Macphail, which suggested that the Government of India might be asked to nominate a representative or that the Board might invite the Government of India to nominate a representative. Ultimately the resolution as originally framed was carried. [Appendix C. 38 (iii).]

The Conference at 2-45 P.M. resumed its discussion on the Inter-University Board. The next recommendation of the Committee was moved by Dr. Gour:—

"The headquarters of the Board should be at the capital of India but the Board shall meet at such centre as may be decided by the Board from time to time."

Diwan Bahadur Ramachandrarao moved to omit the words "the headquarters of the Board should be at the capital of India but," his amendment having the effect of making the resolution read "the Board shall meet at such centres as may be decided by the Board from time to time". He was seconded by Dr. Dhar.

Professor C. V. Raman moved that "the headquarters of the Board should be at Allahabad and the Board should meet periodically at such centres as may prove convenient from time to time." This amendment was seconded by Dr. Bhatnagar.

After a lengthy discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of locating the Board in proximity to the Government of India it was agreed to leave the question for determination by the Board itself, and it was resolved:—

"That the Board shall decide where its permanent headquarters shall be, but pending such decision its office shall be at the headquarters of the Government of India, and the Board shall meet at such centres as may be decided by the Board from time to time. The Board shall meet at least once a year." (Appendix C. 39.)

The Conference then discussed the cost of maintaining the Board. The Committee had proposed that half the cost of the maintenance of the Board should be met by the Government of India and the other half by equal contributions from universities. Professor C. V. Raman, seconded by Dr. Ganesh Prasad, moved to substitute "the cost of the maintenance of the Board shall be met by equal contributions from the universities." He, however, accepted an alternative amendment moved by Dr. Macphail which was passed by the Conference. "The Conference recommends:—

"(i) that the cost of maintaining the Board be met by equal contributions from the universities;

"(ii) that the Government of India and the provincial governments be requested to make grants towards the expenses of the Board." (Appendix C. 40.)

The next recommendation "that the Conference expects universities to pay the travelling allowance of their own representatives" was opposed by the delegates from the Madras and Calcutta universities. A suggestion made by Mr. Littlehales that the University authorities of the place at which the Conference of University delegates was held should bear the expenses of all the delegates was not supported. On the question being put to the vote 18 voted for and 18 against. On a recount the ayes were 20 and noes were 20. The President declared the motion as not carried.

Mr. Hunter proposed "that this Conference recommends to the Government of India that the travelling allowance of the delegates to the first meeting of the Inter-University Board should be met by the Government of India." The motion was carried. (Appendix C. 41.)

Mr. Hunter then moved the next recommendation of the Committee, namely, "the Government of India be requested to intimate to the National Committee of the League of Nations on Intellectual Co-operation that the proposed inter-university organisation should be recognised as an institution which the international committee should consult with a view to the formation of an Indian National Committee."

Dr. Gour moved as an amendment that the initial words should read "upon the Board coming into existence the Government of India be requested to inform, etc." The resolution as amended was carried. (Appendix C. 42.)

CHAPTER VI.

Proceedings of May the 23rd, 1924.

The Conference met at 10-30 A.M. In the unavoidable absence of the Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma, Mr. J. A. Richey was elected to the Chair.

Professor C. V. Raman moved and Diwan Bahadur Ramachandrarao seconded the following resolution framed by Committee number (iii).

“ That it be recommended to the Government of India that with a view to promoting co-operation among Indian universities in higher scientific studies and research and to advising the Government of India from time to time generally with regard to the promotion of scientific research in India, a central advisory board for scientific research be constituted in India comprising the heads of scientific departments of the Government of India and representatives of science nominated by each of the Indian Universities.”

Sir Lalubhai Shah moved an amendment the effect of which was to omit all reference to the Government of India “ that it be recommended to the universities that with a view to promote co-operation among the Indian universities in higher scientific studies and research a Central Board for scientific research be constituted in India of representatives of science nominated by each of the Indian universities.”

Dr. Gour and others opposed the amendment on the ground that it would be unwise not to obtain the help of the eminent scientists employed in Government departments who were after all servants of the Indian public. Professor C. V. Raman explained that the Board might usefully suggest to the Government of India opportunities for helping scientific research. After discussion the amendment was lost only two persons voting for it.

Mr. Littlehailes suggested the addition of the words “ and by the Indian Institute of Science ” at the end of the resolution.

Mr. Hartog pointed out that there were other institutions of science not affiliated to any university, and Dr. Gour proposed the following alternative addition:—

“ and by the Indian Institute of Science with power to co-opt representatives of other recognised institutes of science not affiliated to any university.”

This amendment with minor technical amendments moved by Dr. Macphail was accepted and the resolution as amended was passed. (Appendix C. 18.)

Dr. S. A. Khan raised the question of the admission of research scholars in history to consult the records contained in the Imperial Record Office, Calcutta. He instanced a case in which permission had been refused. The Chairman stated that the question could be raised at a later period in the proceedings if time permitted.

Professor Burrell moved the next recommendation of the Committee:—

“The Conference is of opinion that economy in university finance and increase in efficiency will be rendered possible by the co-ordination of post-graduate studies in Indian universities, especially in provinces containing more than one university.”

Professor Burrell explained the possibilities of co-ordination between the different universities in the United Provinces. Dr. Ghosh observed that this recommendation left it free for the Universities to develop their Honours Schools as recommended by the Sadler Commission, and it would be a great mistake to debar many eminent teachers, who might be running these Honours Schools, from doing advanced work, and thus attracting students in post-graduate classes. Several delegates found difficulty in understanding how such co-ordination could be achieved. Mr. Campbell moved as an amendment that the following be substituted for the original resolution:—

“The Conference is of opinion that the question of co-ordination of post-graduate studies in Indian universities be referred to the Inter-University Board for report.”

This amendment was seconded by Mr. Tostevin, but was rejected by the Conference.

Dr. Urquhart moved the omission of the words “especially in provinces containing more than one university.” The amendment was accepted by Professor Burrell and by the Conference. The amended resolution was then put to the Conference with a slight textual change and carried by a majority. (Appendix C. 43.)

The two following recommendations moved by Diwan Bahadur Ramachandrarao and by Mr. Hunter were accepted with only slight textual changes (Appendix C. 24.):—

“It is desirable that the proposed Indian Universities' Bureaux may continue to use, when formed, the existing organisation in the United Kingdom.”

“The question of forming a separate central agency in London for Indian universities should be deferred till further experience has been gained of the working of the proposed university bureaux.”

The Conference then proceeded to discuss the recommendations of Committee number (iii) on the subject of the proposed Indian Journal of Science.

Mr. Natesan moved:—

“ This Conference is of opinion that it is not desirable to have only a single journal of science for the whole of India, but there should be all-India journals dealing with special branches of knowledge.”

Professor Raman moved to add the following words to the resolution:—

“ (i) and that efforts should be made to utilize or combine existing organs of publication and to develop them into publications having an all-India basis;

(ii) that the central advisory committee for scientific research should be entrusted with the task of co-ordinating scientific publications in India and recommending to Government cases where financial assistance from the State would be desirable.”

The resolution with Professor Raman's amendment was accepted without discussion. (Appendix C. 19.)

Recommendation No. (2) of the Committee was withdrawn.

Dr. Bahl moved the third recommendation:—

“ This Conference is of opinion that the records of the Indian Museum (a journal of Indian Zoology), the Records of the Botanical Survey of India, Memoirs of the Geological Survey of India and the Agricultural Journal of India, now issued by Government, should have on their editorial boards expert representatives of the various universities and that the scope of these journals should be enlarged.”

Professor Raman suggested that it would not be proper for the Conference to pass a resolution of this kind without first consulting the heads of scientific departments and hearing their views. It was therefore decided by the Conference on the motion of Mr. Khub Ram that this resolution should be referred in the form of a recommendation to the Central Advisory Committee for Scientific Research. (Appendix C. 20.)

Since recommendations Nos. (4) and (5) of the Committee were covered by the resolutions already passed they were with the leave of the Conference withdrawn.

Mr. Khub Ram moved:—

“ This Conference considers it desirable that the Indian Science Congress be requested to make efforts to start a combined journal for physics and mathematics on an all-India basis on the lines of the journals of the Indian Botanical Society and the Indian Chemical Society and that the Government and the universities be requested to encourage and support the same.”

Dr. Ganesh Prasad strongly opposed the resolution on the ground that physics and mathematics were too important subjects to be combined in a single publication. Professor Raman thought that the object of the resolution was already met by the amendment moved by him and accepted by the Conference to the first recommendation of the Committee. On this ground and on the understanding that the whole question would be considered by the proposed central advisory committee for scientific research, Mr. Khub Ram withdrew his motion.

Mr. Hartog moved a supplementary resolution :—

“ That the Government of India be requested to remit the payment of customs duty on scientific apparatus and chemicals imported for the use of universities.”

Mr. Hartog stated that in 1921, at his suggestion, the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities of India with one exception, which, he thought, was accidental, had moved the Government of India to remit the payment of customs duty on scientific apparatus and chemicals imported for the use of the universities, but their request was refused. He urged that the Conference should support this request on the following grounds :—

The tax of 15 per cent. was a very heavy charge on the universities and for many years the Government colleges had been exempted from that tax, though it was understood that they had been recently required to pay it. The tax could not be regarded as protection for Indian firms manufacturing apparatus and chemicals. At any rate no such protection was required for the charges for insurance and freight were so heavy in the case of apparatus and chemicals that no educational institution would obtain them from abroad if they could be obtained from India. The tax was a very serious bar to the development of scientific education and hence, of Indian industries. He compared it with the charge of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on mechanically driven machinery and suggested that there was no justification for the difference. If there was any industry in India that needed protection it was the educational industry and he sincerely hoped that Government might be induced to remit the duty.

The Conference, while unanimously in favour of this resolution, disclosed some divergence of opinion with regard to enlarging its scope. The representatives of the Benares Hindu University suggested the addition of machinery and plant used in engineering colleges, etc. It was pointed out that the duty on such imports was at present much lower than that on scientific apparatus. Mr. Hartog was also averse to making too large demands on Government in the first instance. Finally the resolution as proposed was passed with the addition at the end of the words “ and for approved educational institutions.” (Appendix C. 21.)

Item (vi) of the agenda had not for lack of time been dealt with by Committee number (iv), to whom it had been referred; but the Chairman suggested that the Conference might deal with

it at this stage as it raised issues of great importance to Indian students.

Dr. Gour then moved :—

“ This Conference desires to represent to the University of Oxford the serious disability imposed on Indian graduates by the new Statute requiring as a qualification for admission to the status of a junior student that a candidate must have taken Latin, Greek, French or German for his degree.”

Dr. Ganesh Prasad stated that the question had been fully considered by the Academic Council of the Allahabad University who had framed definite proposals for the amendment of the Statute which they intended to submit to the Oxford authorities. He read a copy of these proposals and suggested that they should be attached to the resolution in the form of a recommendation. It was felt by several members that the proposals of the Allahabad University were too lengthy and involved for proper consideration by the Conference in the time at its disposal. It also appeared that these proposals might not be equally applicable to the circumstances of each university. It was therefore decided that the task of framing constructive proposals should be entrusted to the Inter-University Board and the original motion of Dr. Gour was passed *nem con.* (Appendix C. 25.)

The Chairman informed the Conference that he had learnt from the High Commissioner that the Senate of the Cambridge University had at their meeting on May the 17th adopted an amendment to their original regulation permitting those whose native country was situated in Asia or Africa and who were not of European descent to offer Arabic, Sanskrit, Classical Chinese or Pali in lieu of Latin or Greek.

The Conference recorded its appreciation of the action of the Cambridge University in making this concession in favour of Indian students.

At this stage in the proceedings Sir Narasimha Sarma resumed the Chair. Professor Coueslant moved :—

“ This Conference recommends to the Government of India to ask the University of London to examine in India candidates for all its degrees provided that such candidates have been regularly prepared at an Indian university.”

Professor Coueslant explained the value of obtaining the degrees of the London University in engineering and stated that he had been in correspondence with the London University on this subject. The motion was supported by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. He said he did not desire to encourage Indian students to hanker after the degrees of foreign universities. He rather wished to encourage them to be proud, like the Japanese, of the degrees of their own universities. He had been told that the Japanese students went in

large number to foreign countries for special study in certain subjects: but after completing their periods of study in some of the best universities of the world, they went back to their own country, and rejoiced in possessing the highest degrees of their own universities. He would like Indian students to do the same. But he supported the proposal to this extent that as there was only one engineering college in India imparting instruction and training for degrees in Mechanical, Electrical and Mining Engineering, namely the Engineering College at the Benares Hindu University, if some of its students, after they had appeared for the degree examination of the Benares Hindu University, desired also to sit for the corresponding degree of the London University, he would let them do so for some time. For this would be a very fair competition and the standard of instruction imparted at Benares would be subjected to an additional test. The standards prescribed for the degree examinations of the London and the Benares Universities in question were nearly the same. That made the competition possible. Some of the students of the Benares University had been allowed to sit for the London City and Guilds Examination at which students from many parts of the British Empire competed; and two of them had won the first places in Mechanical Engineering. No special instruction had to be given to them. The preparation which they were undergoing for the examination of their own University, sufficed to enable them to compete at the City and Guilds Examination, and with gratifying results. If the Conference thought that the course proposed should be encouraged for some time, to the extent he had indicated, the resolution might be accepted.

Mr. Richey read extracts from a letter received from the Secretary to the High Commissioner in which he stated that an increasing number of Indian students were applying direct to the University of London asking it to hold its examinations in India; that the London University had discontinued this practice in 1897 as the result of the adoption of a policy by the University of examining only in those countries in which no university existed; that the London University did, however, hold its examinations in other colonies and dominions under arrangements made with local universities and that the London University had not so far agreed to hold its examinations in India since it understood that such a step would be contrary to the policy of the Government of India.

Dr. Gour strongly opposed the resolution on the ground that it was subversive of the principle of unitary teaching and would, if accepted, convert the universities of India into cram shops destroying all chances of the developing of real university life and culture in the country.

The Hon'ble Mr. Natesan then moved that Mr. Coueslant's resolution be passed over and the Conference should proceed to the next business of the day.

The mover of the resolution withdrew his motion, not because he felt any doubt of its expediency, but in order to save the time of the Conference, which was evidently not in favour of its acceptance.

The Conference resumed its deliberations at 2-30 P.M., Sir Narasimha Sarma in the Chair. The Conference first completed the consideration of item (xi) on the agenda, on which subject Mr. Hartog had given notice in the morning session of a motion. Mr. Hartog's motion ran as follows:—

“ That the Conference requests the representatives of each university to nominate a member to serve on a provisional committee to meet at Simla immediately after the conclusion of the Conference for the purpose of making to the universities further detailed suggestions with regard to the formation of an Inter-University Board, on such subjects as (i) the date by which the reports of the universities in response to the resolutions of the Conference should be received; (ii) the initial financial requirements of the proposed Board; and (iii) the practical arrangements to be made for the first meeting of the Board including the place of its first meeting.”

In support of his motion Mr. Hartog explained that universities could not be expected to accept the recommendations of the Conference for the formation of an Inter-University Board without having before them for consideration more concrete proposals especially on the subject of the expenditure involved than those embodied in the general resolutions of the Conference.

Mr. Hartog's motion being carried (Appendix C. 47) he moved further:—

“ That the Conference requests the Government of India to forward the resolutions of the Conference and of the provisional committee relating to the proposed Inter-University Board to the Indian universities, and if the majority of the universities agree to these resolutions, to make arrangements in accordance with the conclusions adopted by these universities, for the first meeting of the Inter-University Board.”

The motion was carried (Appendix C. 48) and the different universities at once proceeded to nominate their representatives to serve on the provisional committee.

(The composition of the committee which met on May the 24th and the recommendations made by it will be found in Appendix D.)

The Conference next proceeded to consider item (iv) of the agenda on which the Committee had been able to frame very few recommendations. The first recommendation was moved by Mr. Dhruva:

“ That this Conference is of opinion that mutual recognition of degrees and examinations by Indian universities should be encouraged.”

In support of the recommendation Mr. Dhruva remarked that the proposition, which he had the honour to move on behalf of the Committee appointed to consider item no. (iv) was the only proposition which had survived as the fittest after a number of other propositions dealing with the question of standardisation of courses and examinations had been carefully considered and rejected. It was, he said, the only proposition, which did not interfere with the autonomy of universities in the matter of courses and examinations and had besides received the unanimous support of the Committee.

Dr. Gour, Dr. Macphail, Professor Sahay and Mr. Hartog put in amendments to this resolution.

Dr. Gour moved:—

“ This Conference (i) recommends to the Universities the desirability of taking steps to standardise their examinations with a view to facilitate the mutual recognition of their examinations and degrees by the universities in India and the United Kingdom and (ii) recommends when possible mutual recognition of examinations and degrees.”

Dr. Macphail moved:—

“ (i) That it is desirable that a university should accept the corresponding examinations conducted or accepted by other universities in the case of students who for reasons satisfactory to the university authority concerned seek admission to universities other than the one for admission to which they originally qualified.

“ (ii) That while it is not desirable to declare that examinations and degrees are equivalent which in point of fact are not it is desirable that if possible real equivalence in Indian degrees should be obtained, provided that this equivalence be not obtained by lowering any existing standard.

“ (iii) That it is desirable in the interests of education that a university course in Arts and Science should be of not less than three years' duration after admission to the university, and that this course should ordinarily be spent in one and the same institution provided that where the entrance examination is of the present matriculation or school leaving certificate standard the course shall be of not less than four years' duration.”

Mr. Hartog moved:—

“ That in the opinion of the Conference, the length of an Honours course for the Bachelor's degree in Arts and Science, subsequent to the passing of an examination of the Intermediate standard, should be not less than three years.”

Mr. Horne in place of Professor Sahay, moved:—

“(i) That in order to prevent a lowering of the standard of degree examinations it is desirable that the teaching up to the Intermediate stage and the Intermediate examination should be conducted by the university.

“(ii) That the number of marks which a student must obtain to get a first class and a second class at the Matriculation and Intermediate should be the same in every university, namely 60 per cent. for a First class and 45 per cent. for a Second class.

“(iii) That in order to keep the standard of the M.A. and the degree examinations (Honours and pass) at a high level it is desirable that the universities should arrive at a mutual agreement to allot at least half the number of examinerships to external examiners.”

The Hon'ble Mr. Natesan moved:—

“The recommendations of the Committee and the amendments moved here be forwarded to the Inter-University Board for report at the next conference.”

This was supported by Principal Maitra on the understanding that the opinions of universities should first be obtained and their replies tabulated in the form of a statement. The Chairman ruled that Mr. Natesan's amendment being of the widest scope should be taken first and it was carried. (Appendix C. 44.)

Dr. Macphail then moved:—

“That it be a recommendation to the local governments that grants made to the universities be ordinarily block grants and that the universities bureau, when established, be requested to consider the question of the financial relations of the universities with the local governments.”

This was accepted by the Conference. (Appendix C. 46.)

Dr. Gour moved:—

“That this Conference considers it necessary that the Government should take some steps, legislative or otherwise, to prevent the sale and use of bogus degrees in India.”

It was decided that this topic should be referred to the Inter-University Board. (Appendix C. 45.)

Mr. Hartog moved and Mr. A. Hydari seconded the following resolution:—

“That the cordial thanks of this Conference of the Universities of India be offered to the Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma for the very great service which he has rendered to the Indian universities by summoning the Con-

ference, and by his courteous and able conduct in the Chair; and that the warm thanks of the Conference be also accorded to the Hon'ble Mr. Richey for his services in making arrangements for the organisation of this Conference and to Mr. Rushbrook Williams as its Secretary."

Mr. Hartog stated that he ventured to move the resolution because the Conference might be regarded as the direct outcome of the recommendations of the Calcutta University Commission for the constitution of some central organisation for education after the transference of that subject to provincial governments and his colleague on the Commission—Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad,—who had unfortunately been obliged to leave, had originally consented to second the motion. It was obvious that some members of the Conference had, at the outset, been apprehensive lest the part played by Government might prejudice the newly acquired autonomy of the Indian universities. But he thought that the impartiality of the Chairman, and of Mr. Richey who had acted as Chairman on one occasion, must have removed any such apprehensions. At any rate it was quite clear from the discussions that the presence of important members of Government had in no wise hampered the expression of opinion on the part of the University delegates. From his experience as a member of the Central Advisory Board of Education which was established on the recommendation of the Calcutta University Commission, but had disappeared under the axe of the Inchcape Committee, he felt sure that the Government of India had no desire to dominate the universities, but only wished to help them. They must all be grateful for the great courtesy and tact shown by the Chair and for the care and ability with which the Conference had been organised. The success of the Conference was very largely due to the preliminary arrangements which had been made by Sir Narasimha Sarma and Mr. Richey. They were also grateful to Mr. Rushbrook Williams who, although he did not belong to the Education Department, had kindly consented to act as Secretary of the Conference.

The representatives of each university supported the resolution, which was carried by acclamation. (Appendix C. 49.)

Sir Narasimha Sarma briefly replied, thanking the delegates for their vote of thanks on behalf of himself and Messrs. Richey and Rushbrook Williams. He also congratulated the Conference upon the work achieved and declared the Conference closed. [Appendix A (ii).]

APPENDIX A.

Addresses by the Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma.

(i) INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

Let me add a few words of personal welcome to what has been said already by His Excellency in such felicitous terms this morning. The Government of India and my Department, not to speak of myself, readily appreciate the cordial response which has been accorded by the various universities to our invitation and for their promise of co-operation. And let me thank you, gentlemen assembled here, for your so readily and cheerfully acquiescing in the call of your universities to attend this conference at much personal inconvenience and self-sacrifice, especially so in the case of most of you who had to undertake a long, an arduous and inconvenient journey in the burning heat of a hot summer month. In welcoming you, I feel that it is but right and proper that I should add a few words to what has been already said by His Excellency to indicate and emphasise what are and what are not our objects in convening this conference. The Government of India recognise that education, including university education, is a provincial subject. As has been pointed out by His Excellency there is not the slightest disposition in any quarter to interfere with or to detract or subtract in any manner whatsoever from the autonomous or self-governing powers possessed by the various universities. There is no intention to produce a dull level of monotonous, lifeless and soulless uniformity. We readily recognise the diversity of conditions prevailing in the various provinces and that education can be developed and advanced along healthy lines only by looking forward to diversity suited to the capacities of the people within the charge of the several universities, to their peculiarities and temperament and to their means of adaptation. But all the members of the Conference, I believe, will readily recognise that it is also essential that there should be a unity of purpose and of design running through it all, and it is the intention of the Government of India, in asking the universities to co-operate with them, to promote, if possible, that unity of purpose and design. The Government of India had the Lytton Committee's report before them some time ago and have sent that report to the various local governments and universities for their opinion. They felt that it was desirable that there should be a conference at which the various universities could, through their representatives, discuss amongst other problems the overseas student problem, which we shall have to meet and face boldly and openly if we are to avoid some of the evils which have been pointed out in such graphic terms in the Lytton Committee's report. Our idea, and I believe it is the idea of the Indian people generally, is

to make India self-contained, as self-contained as possible, so that within the four corners of the Indian Empire you may have university institutions of the highest standing to which students and research scholars may resort without the painful necessity of having to go abroad in quest of knowledge of a high order. But we all recognise the paucity, the inadequacy of the yellow and white metals, especially when they are wanted for educational purposes. And recognising as we do that painful and ugly fact, the only question is, how are we to conserve and husband our resources and utilise them to the best advantage, so that, without any unnecessary duplication, we may be able to establish within India at least one institution in each branch of knowledge of the type I have already mentioned. Gentlemen, I hope that your endeavours, with the experience you possess, will be fruitful in devising measures to bring about this result.

There is only one matter to which I need refer and that is that in the new life that is before us, when we have started new universities and are embarking upon fresh experiments in that direction, it is very desirable that university experience should be available to all, so that the corporate influence of the whole body may be utilised for the purpose of assisting each and every individual university to aim at a fairly high minimum standard of excellence, so that the degree which may be conferred by any university may be respected both at home and abroad. I know this is a vexed problem and that we can proceed but slowly and cautiously and that we should do so without an unnecessary sacrifice of the needs of expansion. I have during my short experience as a Member of the Government of India had to face this problem, especially in selecting candidates for the various public services. Two years ago when I was in charge of the Public Works Department we had to call an engineering conference. In selecting students for the Indian Forest Service, I had great difficulty in appraising the value of the degrees conferred by the various universities, and some of the problems which confront the Government of India and the local Governments will have to be faced equally by this Conference, so that as satisfactory a solution as possible may be arrived at in order to co-ordinate the activities of the several universities in achieving this common purpose of having a fair minimum level up to which each university must strive to improve its standards. If in the case of any university those standards are not considered to be sufficiently high—though I do not for a moment suggest that in the case of any university the ideals or standards are low—but if in the course of the conference proceedings it be found to be necessary to consider this question, I hope you will readily recognise the need for an appreciation of the situation, and, without raising angry factious cries, achieve the object aimed at by means of the gentle influence which a corporate body like this can bring to bear upon the life and activities of the individual universities working for the same end.

Now, gentlemen, I shall not detain you more with detailing the purposes for which we are met here to-day. The agenda which has

been circulated already must have indicated to you some of the objects we have before us. I shall now say just a word or two about the procedure which we may adopt without inconvenience.

I have invited the members of the general committee attached to my Department in order that they may give any assistance that may be required of them and may themselves reap the benefit by listening to the discussions here; the general Committee of the Government of India dealing with education is deeply interested in this subject. Of course they are not part of this conference in the strict technical sense of the term. They have no right to vote and they will speak with the permission of the President, but it was desirable that we should invite those members in order to have the benefit of their advice when needed and in order that they may also give me later on the benefit of their advice in the light of the discussion that will take place here. A few members of the Departments and of institutions working up to university standards may also give us the benefit of their advice when a suitable occasion arises.

We shall now proceed to form four committees for the purpose of framing resolutions for consideration by the general body of the conference. Unfortunately a few of the delegates have not been able to attend, but possibly the position is not quite so difficult as we felt it might be at one time. The original intention was that universities which have more than four representatives should appoint only one of their members to each committee. Universities which have fewer than four might appoint the same members to more than one committee, provided it is understood that no committee should be delayed in its activities by the absence of a member from that committee. It has been suggested to me that we might take up two of the committees to-morrow morning and two to-morrow evening, and give each university the chance of sending two of its men to each committee. If it is desired that we should adopt that procedure I do not see any difficulty. I think two of the committees can sit to-morrow morning and two in the evening, and each university may appoint two of its members to each committee.

The second point is that I propose with your leave to preside over the deliberations of the general body of the conference, but with regard to committees I would request that each committee should appoint its own president and evolve its own method of procedure. As to whether any time limit for speeches is necessary is a matter for consideration and I would leave it to you with the tentative suggestion that members may perhaps confine their remarks ordinarily to five minutes.

This evening, it is proposed to take up items (v) and (vi). It was suggested to me that perhaps (vi) might be taken up along with (iv) for discussion by a committee and later on for discussion and adoption by the general body of the conference. But I intend to take up (v) and (vi) this afternoon and if it is felt by the conference that any of the points mentioned in (vi) ought to be referred to a committee, that can be done later on, but for the present we will

proceed with (v) and (vi) this evening. All the committees will sit to-morrow and submit their resolutions to the Secretary, it is hoped, in time for circulation to the members of the conference. We can decide later as to whether committees (i) and (ii) should sit in the morning or (iii) and (iv). I would now ask members to settle who is to sit on the various committees.

(ii) VALEDICTORY ADDRESS.

“GENTLEMEN,

I cannot express in words how deeply grateful I am for this mark of appreciation of the efforts made by the Government of India in assisting the Universities in the discharge of their heavy and responsible duty of promoting higher education and research amongst the people of India; and let me also thank you on behalf of the Hon'ble Mr. Richey and Professor Rushbrook Williams for associating them in the remarks which you have made so kindly in respect of me as representing the Government of India. I feel highly indebted to Mr. Richey on whom I laid the very heavy task of organising this Conference, and let me inform you that our obligations to Professor Rushbrook Williams are the greater for the simple reason that he does not belong to my Department, and it is a labour of love that he has undertaken (*Cheers*), and I cordially express my thanks to Professor Rushbrook Williams for having undertaken the arduous duties of Secretary.

Before we disperse let me congratulate you most cordially and heartily upon the success of the deliberations of this Conference. I was indeed very sorry when I, on behalf of the Government of India, extended this invitation to the Universities, that I could not undertake the expenditure involved. I express my regret on behalf of the Government that it has not been found possible to do otherwise. It may have been my mistake; possibly if the matter had been pressed, there might not have been any difficulty, but I did not wish to risk the whole conference falling through, should there be a difference of opinion on the subject, and I therefore ventured to appeal to the universities to bear the burden and to come forward spontaneously and assist the Government of India in this task, and I think perhaps it was wise that it was so done because any efforts spoon fed by the Government of India (and that might have been the construction if we had paid the expenses) would not have had the same importance as we can attach now to the deliberations of this Conference when the delegates or the universities had to spend so much money in coming forward to assist in this Imperial task. We can therefore take credit that this is a practically spontaneous movement on the part of the universities, slightly encouraged by the Central Government whose duty it was to do so, and I attach therefore greater significance to the deliberations of this Conference than might have been possible if the whole thing had been organised, helped and paid for by the Government of India.

Once more, let me thank you for having cordially responded to our invitation and for having come here in such large numbers at such considerable personal sacrifice. The greatest, the most monumental work that I consider this Conference to have done is the resolution unanimously passed recommending to the universities that it is desirable in the opinion of this Conference that an Inter-University organisation should be established for the promotion of higher education and research. I shall not go into details but on the central point, on the important vital principle as to whether it is necessary in the interests of higher education and research there should be such an organisation every member felt equally the importance of the existence of such an organisation and I feel sure the universities will cordially respond and support the views of their delegates although when those delegates were sent up here they had no mandate from the universities that such an organisation should be built up. We hope for very great things from the existence of this organisation and I wish good luck to the efforts of this Conference and let me express the hope that this organisation will be brought into being without any very great delay.

There are one or two points which I think I may bring to the notice of the representatives of the universities, which struck me when I was considering the question of higher education and university education, both in relation to education proper, as well as in relation to the subjects themselves on our agenda, the improvement of the resources of this country, particularly agricultural resources. Members of this Conference must have had their attention already directed to the circumstance that higher education is becoming more and more provincialised and that with the Reforms and the legitimate pride which each province is taking in asserting its own autonomy, its own authority, its own importance, new problems are arising which await solution. Very soon I believe in the matter of the recruitment of many of the services it is just possible that the provinces will become autonomous. How soon it is impossible to say, but it is quite clear that sooner rather than later that will be the achievement. I am not going to argue whether it is desirable or not. It is a fact and has a bearing on the question of standards. There have been two schools of thought all along, one insisting upon the expansion of higher education and the other upon efficiency and a high standard, and the Indian universities as a whole have been, rightly or wrongly, attaching greater importance to the development and expansion of higher education in the interests of the country than to the need of efficiency, not that the need of efficiency was sought to be neglected or minimised, but of the two factors greater importance was attached to the other, and possibly the multiplication of university degrees and the conferment of university degrees on a large number was developed and encouraged by the various universities with a view to encourage higher education. It had a meaning and significance at one time in upper India when there was only one university which catered to her needs, but now I foresee that with the development of provincial autonomy, with the weakening of central authority in certain respects and with direct recruitment by provincial Govern-

ments it is not a matter of such great significance. Whether you call a particular standard of education and its attainment as necessary for a degree does not make any great difference, so long as qualified students can get entrance into the various services in a province. I am only making a suggestion that the universities may look upon this question in a different light because it is immaterial so long as Ministers have control over recruitment in the provinces and the tendency to recruit within the province develops as it is bound to develop whether you call a standard an intermediate or pass degree standard. The cognate question or inter-allied question is that inasmuch as that is the tendency, it may perhaps be possible for the universities to insist upon a fairly high standard for their general degrees or honours degrees as the case may be, because these degrees would be a passport to the central and all-India services and would also be a means of recognition by all the Indian universities as well as the universities abroad. I only put forward this as a possible reason for the question being approached from a new angle.

The other point is that it is equally the duty of the universities as well as the Government to have a census of their university graduates and the occupations they are filling and the universities should have some general idea of the possibilities of expansion of recruitment for industrial and other activities which are likely to absorb the graduates who will be their product in future years. I know the Government of India have been blamed for not bringing the question of an undue multiplication of the numbers of university graduates and their inability to find a career before this Conference. It is not that I have lost sight of the problem. I am having materials collected for the purpose of helping the people of India with a knowledge of the exact position, but the materials are not ready, and I hope therefore the universities will help Government in securing the necessary information. I lay special emphasis for this reason: those that argue against the limitation of the numbers of graduates have been met in the past and are being met in the present with the argument: "How can you restrict the number because as education expands the number of primary institutions must expand, then the secondary schools must expand. There would therefore be a necessity for graduate teachers. The number of first class colleges must consequently increase in numbers and expand. These are all mutually inter-dependent." The argument has great meaning but it is minimised by the unfortunate fact that although it may be true, if he had a programme which could be supported by the representatives of the people, providing expansion within a definite period of years there is none such at present. As a matter of fact we are finding that neither the existing colleges and schools nor those likely to be started in the near future will be in a position to absorb the growing numbers. Mr. Bhoré was telling me a few days ago that it was pitiable to see students who have specialised in various branches of knowledge in Europe coming back to India and finding absolutely no career open to them. It is possible that the universities if they should have before them some clear idea of the requirements of their own province would within a

measurable period of time so adjust their standards as to be able to give advice to parents and students in what directions their energies might be directed, so as to be fruitful to them as well as to the country at large.

The third point is this:—The necessity of some high standard being approximated to by the various universities and the fact that in future the Government of India will be interested in requiring the universities to develop that high standard so as to be able to meet their needs. I have already spoken of the provinces finding employment for a certain number. The Government of India too can provide for a limited number. I had this difficulty of standard before me and pointed it out when I attended the Engineering Conference and some proposals were formulated for the purpose of attaining a common standard in engineering education. I was told that the Railway Board finds it difficult to know exactly what the standards are and in the interest of the students of the universities it is desirable that some attention should be paid to the requirements of the Government of India.

The fourth point is of extreme importance, *viz.*, higher research and higher education in the field of the material development of the resources of this country. I will not frighten the conference, but I am not satisfied, speaking for myself and not as a Member of the Government of India for the time being, that we shall be secure and self-supporting unless we increase our agricultural production considerably, and one of the points that struck me as soon as I took over charge in 1920 was the point brought to my notice by the Agricultural Branch, that if it were only possible to induce the country to recognise the importance of scientific research, apart from questions of increased production, a good deal of waste may be avoided. I tried to form an Entomological Department but in this difficulties of finance stood in my way. The enormous destruction and wastage going on in this country by the ravages of insect pests and fungi are so large that we cannot have too much of research in entomology and mycology. We have to look to botanists in connection with cotton research as well as other agricultural products and one thing struck me forcibly that perhaps more could be done by the universities in the direction of developing the study of botany and the allied sciences, upon which the whole of the future of the agricultural industry so largely depends. Only the other day a provincial Government asked me to look for a research expert from outside India. I looked over the list of all the pending applications and I asked whether I could recommend anyone to that Government from within it. It was with great regret that I had to attempt to recruit from outside India.

I have taken the liberty of taking up your time because I feel that the universities can help by insisting upon the affiliation of only such colleges as are properly equipped as well as by promoting the study of subjects on which the prosperity of this country so largely depends.

I believe you have passed a resolution thanking the Cambridge University for the alterations which they have accepted in their

regulations to meet the Indian point of view. Our thanks are really due to those authorities for the help they have rendered, and I hope that Oxford will be able to join Cambridge in the line the latter has taken.

I hope your labours in this and other directions will bear fruit. I wish you a happy and safe return to your homes with a weakening of the prejudice (if any) against Simla and those living here. (Loud applause.)

APPENDIX B.

Notes supplied to the delegates on items of the agenda.

Item No. (i) (a).—The Appointment and Conditions of Service of whole-time University Teachers.

This subject has been suggested for discussion under the following heads:—

1. The method of selecting and appointing University Professors, Readers and Lecturers. (Madras.)
2. The salaries and conditions of service of University Professors, Readers and Lecturers. (Madras.)
3. Salaries. (Dacca.)
4. Provident Fund. (Dacca.)
5. Recruitment of staffs from abroad. (Dacca.)
6. Possibility of reciprocal arrangements between Indian Universities regarding notice of leaving and appointment—especially for Professors and Readers, and also regarding Provident Fund, Furlough and other leave. (Punjab.)

Closely connected with it is—

Item No. (i) (b).—The Exchange of University Teachers.

1. Exchange of Teachers. (Dacca.)
2. Joint arrangements for inviting Teachers from abroad. (Dacca.)
3. The Exchange of Professors, Readers and Teachers between the different Universities. (Delhi.)
4. Short time Exchange of Teachers and Scholars. (Allahabad and Benares.)
5. Transfer and Exchange of Professors. (Benares.)
6. Exchange of Professors and Lecturers for short periods. (Mysore.)

Item No. (ii).—The Exchange of Library Books.

An All-Indian Conference of Librarians was held at Lahore in January 1918. This Conference recommended that the principle of inter-borrowing of books between libraries of all kinds should be adopted as far as may be practicable. For this purpose it recommended the division of India into circles. The recommendations of this Conference were not carried out owing firstly to difficulties of organisation and secondly to the political changes of 1921 when 'libraries' became a provincial transferred subject.

It is for consideration whether Universities can co-operate in library matters. Every University will deem it necessary to maintain an adequate Library for its own staff and students for whose use the great majority of the books must be at any time available. The possibilities of mutual help therefore narrow themselves down to:—

- (a) The exchange or gift of superfluous library matter. Some of the older and more established Libraries may be able to assist the younger Universities in this manner;
- (b) The temporary loan of valuable works for research scholars and teachers. This might result in co-operation between a limited number of Universities for the purchase of more expensive or more highly technical works of reference.

The experience of the results of the Librarians' Conference shows that if circles for inter-borrowing are created they must be small.

Item No. (iv).—The Equivalence of Indian University Examinations.

This subject has in various forms been suggested by several Universities, *e.g.*,

1. The standardisation of Degrees. (Dacca and Punjab.)
2. The desirability of securing uniformity of standard in the examinations of Indian Universities for the Bachelors degrees, especially as regards the Honours, and the means to be employed to attain this end. (Nagpur.)
3. The desirability of securing uniformity of standard in specific subjects of the Matriculation Examination of Indian Universities or its equivalents. (Nagpur.)
4. Equalisation of the standard of the Matriculation Examination all over India. (Punjab and Delhi.)
5. The standardisation of all University Examinations so as to secure a maximum standard of ability and efficiency in all graduates turned out by the Universities. (Delhi.)
6. The possibility of obtaining more uniformity of standard in the courses of study for similar degrees in the different Universities. (Lucknow.)
7. Equivalence of standards. (Allahabad.)
8. Mutual recognition of degrees and examinations by Indian Universities. (Benares.)
9. Recognition of attendance and work at a University by other Universities qualifying for M.A. and M.Sc. degrees. (Mysore.)

Certain specific methods for achieving such standardisation have also been suggested for discussion:—

- (a) The holding of joint examinations in certain subjects in order to avoid expense. (Delhi.)
- (b) The desirability of erecting some central machinery for facilitating the appointment of external examiners; especially with regard to the feasibility of appointing the same person as co-examiner in a given subject of a given examination for a number of Universities—the papers of each University to be set in each case by the University's own examiner, but the joint co-examiner to examine say 50 answer books for each University, and the examiner or examiners of the individual University to adopt when marking the standard set by the co-examiner in the 50 answer books examined by him. (Nagpur.)
- (c) The creation of a co-ordinating Board to ensure the preservation of one uniform standard of examinations for all Universities in India. (Delhi.) *

Item No. (v).—The Substitution of University Bureaux for Students' Advisory Committees.

Extracts from paragraphs 89 and 92 of Lytton Committee's Report.

“89. We suggest the establishment by each Indian university of a bureau specially staffed and equipped for the purposes:—

- (1) of supplying students wishing to pursue their education abroad with all the information, advice and assistance which they may require;
- (2) of supplying the foreign University authorities with the kind of information regarding the students which will enable them to make their selection from the applications forwarded.

“This Bureau should be administered by the University and should be advised by a Board consisting mainly of persons with recent knowledge of the various British universities. The expenses of the staff should be met by a special grant from Government to the University for the purpose. These University Bureaux would take the place of the existing Advisory Committees. By this means we hope that in time every university in India will be brought into direct communication with every university in the United Kingdom, and the student could pass direct from his Indian University to the British University to which he secures admission without the intervention of any Government official.”

“92. Early in each academic year the Indian University Bureaux would forward to the Secretaries to the Delegacy for Oriental Students at Oxford and the Inter-Collegiate Indian Students' Committee at Cambridge a list of the students desiring admission in

the following October, with full particulars of the qualifications of each and a list of the Colleges or alternate Universities for which they have expressed a reference. This procedure should, we think, enable the authorities at Oxford and Cambridge to make their selection in time for the students who have not been selected to gain admission elsewhere."

2. The proposal to substitute University Bureaux for the present Advisory Committees has met with general acceptance by Local Governments and Universities. This decision may be endorsed by the Conference. It is suggested that a uniform title, *e.g.*, University Students' Information Bureau, be adopted.

3. Some doubt, however, has been expressed as to the suitability of the procedure suggested by the Committee in the second extract.

It is questionable whether the English Universities would welcome a change of system which would inevitably tend to increased correspondence and reference. The following extract illustrates the procedure which one university proposes to adopt under the new system:—

"When a student, to provide alternatives, applies for admission to more than one university, he should address his application to all of these with a request that each of them should communicate to the University Advisory Committee its decision in regard to him by cable, the cost of the cables to be paid by the student. He will then decide which university he prefers to join and inform by cable all the universities concerned of his decision."

It is more than questionable whether English Universities would agree to bear the cost of cabling to a number of Indian students, who may or may not decide to accept their offers of admission, in the hope of recovering the cost of the cables from the students: and it is certain, that in the absence of any machinery to compel them to do so, many students would not take the trouble or go to the expense of cabling to all the universities whose offers they did not accept.

4. The Lytton Committee foresaw this difficulty and therefore made the suggestion which appears on the agenda as:—

"The constitution of a Central University Agency in London."

Extract from paragraph 92 of Lytton Committee's Report.

"It will be necessary, however, for each Bureau to employ an agency in London to receive from Oxford and Cambridge and forward the applications of these students to other Universities in the order of preference which they have themselves expressed and to inform them where they are admitted. We are unable to say whether all the Indian Universities would be willing to be re-

presented by a single agency as we have had no opportunity of consulting them. A single agency would obviously be the best arrangement and the one which would be most acceptable to the British Universities, but we are obliged to leave it to the authorities of the Indian Universities to decide whether they prefer to act independently or in concert."

The majority of Universities recognise the necessity for the maintenance of some central agency in London. The recommendation of the Lytton Committee was made on the assumption that the Indian Students Department would no longer undertake this work, though the Committee recognised the need for an official agency in the High Commissioner's office for the disbursement of Government scholarships, the supervision of Government scholars and assistance of other Indian students.

It has been suggested by one Local Government that the new Universities Bureaux should continue to use the existing organisation, which might in future be termed the Education Department of the High Commissioner's office, till they have had an opportunity of consulting as to the form which any non-official central agency in London should take.

Item No. (vi).—The Recognition of Indian Examinations in the United Kingdom.

Extract from paragraph 28 of the Lytton Committee Report.

"We were impressed by the difficulties and confusion arising from the present lack of uniformity in recognising Indian University examinations and qualifications at the Universities of the United Kingdom. For example, one British University, under certain conditions, exempts from its preliminary examination a student who has taken a first-class in the Intermediate Arts Examination of certain Indian Universities, but does not recognise for this purpose the final B.A. degree of the same universities, unless the student has passed with first or second class honours; while other British Universities do not recognise the first-class Intermediate of an Indian University, but accept the final B.A. degree either with or without conditions. Others again recognise the Indian Intermediate irrespective of class obtained, and one or two accept the Indian Matriculation examinations. This variety of procedure is a source of infinite trouble and difficulty, and the time has certainly arrived when the question of equivalence of the courses in the two countries should be studied by some competent body with a view to establishing greater uniformity of practice."

2. The following statement mentions the exemptions allowed in the matter of admission examinations by the Universities of the United Kingdom. Some of the exemptions are coupled with conditions, which have not however been brought out for the sake of brevity.

Name of University.	Privileges allowed.	Indian Examinations.	Colonial and other Examinations.
1. Oxford . . .	Exemption from Responsions.	An approved degree of an approved University in Arts or Science with certain subjects taken after two years' study, qualifies for the status of a junior student who is admitted as a fourth term student at the University. A first class or second class honour's degree qualifies for the status of a senior student, who is admitted as a fourth term student and excused moderations. (For detailed information, see Appendix I.)	Certain Matriculation, School leaving and other examinations. (Certain European countries, South Africa, Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, Canada and Hong Kong.) Two years' study at a University qualifies for the status of a junior student. A degree taken after three years' study qualifies for the status of a senior student.
2. Cambridge	Exemption from several parts of the Previous Examination.	A first class honour's degree (or a second class honour's degree if taken with certain subjects) taken after not less than three years' study at an approved University secures exemption from the Previous Examination and admission as a second, third or fourth term student as the University may in each case decide. (For detailed information see Appendix II.)	The Matriculation Examination (Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand and South Africa), an examination qualifying for admission to a European University or the Egyptian Government Secondary Education Certificate Examination.
3. London . . .	Exemption from the Matriculation Examination.	A degree or in the case of matriculates over 19 years of age a special London University examination.	A degree or in the case of matriculates over 19 years of age a special London University Examination.
4. Scottish Universities.	Exemption from the Preliminary Examination.	The Intermediate Examination of a recognised University in Arts or Science.	Any examination qualifying for admission to a degree course of a University.
5. National University of Ireland.	Exemption from the Matriculation Examination.	No Indian qualification entitles to this privilege.	The Senior Public Examination or the Matriculation Examination of the Matriculation Board of South Africa.
6. Wales . . .	Exemption from the Matriculation Examination.	The Intermediate Examination in Arts or Science of an Indian University.	The Examination qualifying for a degree course of a University of the Secondary School Certificate Examination of the Transvaal Education Department.
7. Belfast . . .	<i>Ibid</i>	The Matriculation Examination of an Indian University.	The Matriculation Examination of the Universities of South Africa.
8. Dublin (Trinity College).	<i>Ibid</i>	The Intermediate, or the B. A. Examination of an approved University entitles to credit <i>pro tanto</i> for the first academic year.	The Matriculation Examination of the Universities of South Africa.
9. Durham . . .	<i>Ibid</i>	The Intermediate Examination of a recognised Indian University.	An equivalent examination.
10. Bristol . . .	<i>Ibid</i>	The Intermediate Examination in Arts or Science of an approved Indian University for admission to the corresponding Faculties. The Matriculation Examination with the Intermediate Examination in Arts for the Faculty of Medicine. The Matriculation Examination for the Faculty of Engineering.	Any examination recognised as equivalent to the Matriculation Examination of any University in the United Kingdom.

Name of University.	Privileges allowed.	Indian Examinations.	Colonial and other Examinations.
11. Northern Universities (Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, and Birmingham).	Exemption from the Matriculation Examination.	The Intermediate Examination in Arts, Science, or Medicine of an approved Indian University.	Any examination recognised as equivalent to Oxford Responsions, Cambridge Previous, etc. The Secondary School Certificate Examination of the Egyptian Ministry of Education.

3. Our normal entrance test (*i.e.*, the Indian Matriculation Examination) is not, except in one instance, recognised in the United Kingdom. Attention has been drawn to the standards of the Indian University Examinations in certain recent interpellations in the House of Commons. There is a growing demand for the introduction of certain British University Examinations which command universal respect, *e.g.*, the London University Examinations and the Oxford School Certificate Examination. The Cambridge Local examinations are already held in this country, but are chiefly attended by pupils of European schools.

Appendix i.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Statute relating to Junior and Senior Status.

III.—ON INDIAN UNIVERSITIES.

[Statt. Tit. II Sec. VIII.]

1. Any student of an Indian University who shall have pursued at that university a course of study prescribed by it and extending over two years at the least, and shall have obtained the Degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science at that university, may be admitted to the status and privileges of a junior student, provided that such Degree and such university shall have been approved by the Hebdomadal Council. No Degree shall be approved for the purposes of this clause which does not include the study of English and, in addition, of two of the following languages, Latin, Greek, French, German, Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, Pali, Classical Chinese, of which two either Latin or Greek or French or German must be one.

2. Any student of an Indian University who shall have pursued at that university or, should the Hebdomadal Council in his case so approve, at more than one university, a course of study prescribed by it and extending over three years at the least, and shall have obtained at that university a Degree with first or second-class Honours, may be admitted to the status and privileges of a senior student, provided that such Degree and such university shall have

been approved, for the purpose of this clause, by the Hebdomadal Council.

3. The status and privileges of a junior student shall be as follows:—

- (a) The term in which he is matriculated shall be reckoned, for the purposes of any provisions respecting the standing of members of the university, as the fourth term from his matriculation.
- (b) A junior student shall not be required to pass Responsions.
- (c) A junior student admitted to this status in and after Michaelmas term, 1922, shall be entitled to supplicate for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts if he shall have passed the First Public Examination and kept statutable residence for six terms, and either—
 - (1) shall have obtained a place, or his name shall have been placed as *ægrotat*, in the class list of an Honour School of the Second Public Examination; or
 - (2) shall have satisfied the examiners in the Second Public Examination in the Final Honour School of Natural Science in Chemistry, Part I; or
 - (3) shall have satisfied the examiners in the Second Public Examination in the Final School of Agriculture or of Forestry; or
 - (4) having obtained Honours in the First Public Examination, shall have passed the Second Public Examination; or
 - (5) shall have satisfied the provisions of *Statt. Tit. VI. Sect. I. D. section 3, clause 15.*

No junior student shall be entitled to supplicate for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts unless he shall have satisfied the provisions of this sub-clause.

4. The status and privileges of a senior student shall be as follows:—

- (a) The term in which he is matriculated shall be reckoned, for the purposes of any provisions respecting the standing of members of the university, as the fourth term from his matriculation.
- (b) A senior student shall not be required to pass Responsions or any part of the First Public Examination as a condition for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts.
- (c) A senior student shall be entitled to supplicate for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts if he shall have kept statutable residence for six terms, and either (i) shall have obtained a place, or his name shall have been placed as *ægrotat*, in the class list of an Honour

School of the Second Public Examination; or (ii) shall have satisfied the examiners in the Second Public Examination in the Final Honour School of Natural Science in Chemistry, Part I; or (iii) shall have satisfied the provisions of *Statt. Tit. VI.*, section I.D. Section 3, cl. 15.

No senior student shall be entitled to supplicate for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts unless he shall have satisfied the provisions of this sub-clause.

5. Any person who desires to become a senior or junior student under the provisions of this Statute shall send his application through an officer of a College or Hall or of the Delegacy of Non-Collegiate Students, or of the Society of Oxford Home-Students, to the Registrar of the University, and shall at the same time produce all necessary certificates and information in support of his application. If the application is granted, he shall pay to the university chest, through the Assistant Registrar, an admission fee either of five pounds if he register as a senior student, or of two pounds ten shillings if he register as a junior student. If at the time when the application is granted he has not yet been matriculated, this fee shall be paid within fourteen days of matriculation; if he has been matriculated, it shall be paid within fourteen days from the date of the granting of the application. Any person who makes his application later than four weeks after his matriculation shall pay, if his application is granted, an additional fee of one pound.

6. Any person who has been granted permission to be admitted as a senior or junior student, and who does not pay the required fee within the time prescribed in the preceding clause, shall on admission pay an additional fee of one pound. If he fails to pay the required fee before the Saturday in the eighth week of the full term next following that in which he was granted permission to be admitted as a senior or junior student or was matriculated, whichever happened later, the grant shall lapse, and shall not be renewable without the consent of Convocation.

7. It shall be the duty of the Assistant Registrar to keep a sufficient record of the members of the university who have the status and privileges of a junior or senior student respectively.

Appendix ii.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

AFFILIATED STUDENTS.

New Regulations to be substituted for the existing Regulations as from 1st January 1925.

1. Graduates of universities, which have on the recommendation of the Council of the Senate been approved for the purpose

by Grace of the Senate, shall be entitled to admission to the privileges of affiliation, provided that they submit certificates showing that they have attended classes in such a university for a period of not less than three years, and that they produce either—

- (a) evidence of graduation with First-Class Honours, or a record which, in the opinion of the Council of the Senate, is equivalent to First-Class Honours¹; or
- (b) evidence of graduation with Second-Class Honours (or a record which, in the opinion of the Council of the Senate, is equivalent to Second-Class Honours²), provided that they have passed, in one or more of the examinations by which they have qualified for their degree, in English, two other languages, one of which is either Latin or Greek, and Mathematics.

2. A student admitted to the privileges of Affiliation shall be entitled to any or all of the following privileges:—

- (a) to be exempted from the previous examination;
- (b) to reckon the first term kept by residence as the second, third, or fourth term of his residence, for the purposes of all provisions respecting the standing of candidates for Tripos Examinations or for Degree Examinations in Medicine, Surgery, or Music, and respecting the standing of candidates for Degrees, other than the ordinary B.A. Degree or Degrees conferred under the Regulations for Research Students;
- (c) on producing evidence that he has passed such examinations as may be approved by a Special Board connected with a Tripos, to be allowed to proceed to a part or section of that Tripos under the same conditions as though he had passed another part or section of a Tripos; and, if he shall obtain honours therein, to be admitted Bachelor designate in Arts on the completion of residence for the requisite number of terms, provided that—
- (i) if the examination or examinations as to which evidence is produced are in a subject or subjects other

¹ In the case of approved Universities in the United States of America, the Council of the Senate will in general accept, as such a record, evidence that a student can be regarded as having graduated in the first sixth of his class (that is, all the students of his year), and also that he showed exceptional ability in some subject.

² In the case of approved Universities in the United States of America, the Council of the Senate will in general accept, as such a record, evidence that a student can be regarded as having graduated in the first half of his class (that is, all the students of his year).

than that which the Tripos is concerned, the consent of the General Board of Studies shall be obtained in each case;

- (ii) if a student is allowed under this regulation to proceed to a part or section of a Tripos in respect of which the regulations make different provisions according to the part or section of a Tripos which a student has already passed, the Special Board shall determine which of such provisions shall apply;
- (iii) application for admission to this privilege is made to the Registry before the end of the student's first term of residence;
- (iv) if this examination is taken before the last of the terms which the candidate is required to keep in order to qualify for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts, the candidate shall produce a certificate of "diligent study" for the residue of such terms.

3. (a) If a student admitted to the privileges of affiliation wishes to reckon for any purpose the first term kept by residence as the second, third, or fourth term of his residence, in accordance with the foregoing Regulation 2 (b), application should be made to the Registry for the registration of such allowance.

(b) If a student admitted to the privileges of affiliation has, in accordance with the foregoing Regulation 2 (b), reckoned for any purpose the first term kept by residence as the second, third, or fourth term of his residence, as the case may be, he shall be required so to reckon his first term for all purposes.

4. In the case of any student claiming to be admitted to the privileges of Affiliation, a certificate of having fulfilled the prescribed conditions, signed by the Registrar or other competent authority of the student's university, shall be presented for registration to the Registry in the student's first term of residence, and a fee of £2 shall be paid at the same time to the Registry for the university chest.

5. Any certificate of having fulfilled the prescribed conditions may be accepted for registration at a time later than that above specified, provided that in every such case an additional fee of £1 shall be paid to the Registry for the university chest.

6. Students claiming to be admitted to the privileges of Affiliation shall be required (a) to have fulfilled all the prescribed conditions before matriculation, (b) to matriculate and to pay the usual fee of £5, and (c) to pay the capitation tax in respect of each term allowed under Regulation 2 (b).

Item (x) (a).—Place of Indian Vernaculars in the Curricula of Indian Universities.

Name of important Indian vernaculars.	NUMBER AND NAMES OF UNIVERSITIES AT WHICH PRESCRIBED AS AN OPTIONAL SUBJECT IN THE EXAMINATION FOR—		REMARKS.
	B. A. (pass) degree.	M. A. (pass) degree.	
An Indian vernacular.	¹ A modern Indian language or literature at the Benares Hindu University.	² A modern Indian language or literature at the Benares Hindu University. Indian vernaculars permissible at the Calcutta University.	An Indian vernacular is a compulsory examination subject for the B. O. L. degree of the Punjab University. The Arts Faculty of the Delhi University comprises a Department of Persian and Urdu and a Department of Sanskrit, Hindi and Bengali. The Arts Faculty of the Nagpur University comprises a Department of Arabic, Persian and allied vernaculars and a Department of Sanskrit and allied vernaculars. The Arts Faculty of the Allahabad University comprises a Department of Arabic and Persian and allied vernaculars and a Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit languages.
Urdu . . .	⁸ Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Patna, Dacca, Aligarh Muslim, Osmania and Mysore.	³ Madras, Bombay and Dacca.	Urdu is a compulsory subject in the B. A. Examination of the Aligarh Muslim University. It is the medium of instruction at the Osmania University.
Bengali . . .	³ Calcutta, Patna and Dacca.	¹ Dacca.	
Burmese . . .	² Calcutta and Rangoon.	¹ Rangoon.	
Gujerati . . .	¹ Bombay . . .	¹ Bombay.	
Hindi . . .	³ Calcutta, Patna and Osmania.	..	
Marathi . . .	³ Madras, Bombay and Osmania.	² Madras and Bombay.	
Tamil . . .	³ Madras, Osmania and Mysore.	¹ Madras.	
Telugu . . .	³ Madras, Osmania and Mysore.	¹ Madras.	

Item No. (xi) (c).—The Proposal to form some Permanent Inter-University Organisation.

The need for co-ordination in the work of universities in India is emphasised by the Calcutta University Commission in Chapter

L, paragraphs 46—53 of their report. The Commission, writing before the introduction of the reformed system of government, recommended that the work of co-ordination should be undertaken by the Government of India. The Government of India did in fact by the creation of the Central Advisory Board of Education attempt to provide an agency to which questions of general policy might be referred. This body was, however, of a purely advisory nature, and, though it included three Vice-Chancellors of Indian Universities, it did not deal solely or even chiefly with university questions. Its advice was tendered to the Government of India and through that authority to local Governments. It was closed as a result of the recommendations of the Government of India Retrenchment Committee.

For the work of co-ordination as contemplated by the Calcutta University Commission no agency exists in India. The function of such an agency is considered by the Commission to be the encouragement of specialisation by different universities, more especially in the higher branches of technology, in order to avoid waste of effort and to make the best use of the funds available, and the promotion of research through co-operation.

Since the report of the Commission the establishment of some inter-university organisation has been recommended by three separate authorities:—

- (i) The Congress of the Universities of the Empire held in 1921 passed the following resolution:—

“ That in the opinion of this Congress it is desirable that the universities of the various Dominions of the King overseas should arrange for periodical meetings of their representatives.

“ To this resolution also effect had been given; in Canada by the Conference of Canadian Universities; in Australia by the establishment of the Advisory Committee of Australian Universities; and in South Africa, where, since the Congress of 1912, the single university of the Cape of Good Hope had been replaced by the four universities of South Africa, Cape Town, Stellenbosch, and Johannesburg, by the establishment of the Joint Committee.”

The Indian delegates to the Congress passed the following resolution:—

- “ 1. That Sir Michael Sadler, K.C.S.I., C.B., etc., be elected to represent the Indian Universities upon the Council of the Bureau of Universities of the British Empire.

“ 2. That this meeting recommend to the universities of India that an association or a committee of representatives of the different Indian Universities be formed with the object of dealing with questions affecting their mutual and common interests.

“ In connection with the second resolution, it was suggested that such an association, if formed, should go into the question of certain difficulties which may arise owing to the conditions of admission of students to certain courses and examinations of the universities of the United Kingdom not being suited to the qualifications which students from Indian Universities can present.”

The Universities Bureau of the British Empire addressed the Government of India in March last asking what steps could be taken to give effect to the second resolution.

(ii) The Lytton Committee on Indian students in England in paragraph 100 of their report write:—

“ We have pointed out in Chapter II that much inconvenience and uncertainty is now caused by the lack of uniformity in the recognition by British Universities of Indian Examinations and courses of study. We hope that the Indian University authorities will take steps at an early date to establish an Inter-University Board as recommended by the Calcutta University Commission for the purpose of co-ordinating the courses of study in India and securing uniformity in their recognition abroad. Such a body when formed would also be of great service in securing common action by the Indian Universities in the matter of representation in the United Kingdom to which we have referred in paragraph 92 above.”

(iii) The League of Nations had addressed the attached letter (*vide* Appendix) to the Government of India in which they suggest the formation of a National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

Finally more than one university in submitting suggestions for the agenda of this Conference had assumed or proposed the institution of some central agency.

It will be seen from the foregoing proposals that the functions suggested for such an agency are:—

- (1) to act as an inter-university secretariat and bureau of information;
- (2) to facilitate the exchange of professors and students;
- (3) to assist in the co-ordination of university work, more especially research;
- (4) to publish a journal of Indian research;
- (5) to discuss and report on the equivalence of Indian University examinations;
- (6) to obtain recognition for Indian degrees in other countries;
- (7) to appoint representatives of India at Imperial or international conferences on higher education.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Geneva, 29th January 1924.

At its first session, held in August 1922, the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation considered the position of intellectual work in the various countries. It noted that since the war this position had everywhere become extremely difficult, and that certain countries, which had suffered directly as a result of the war and the economic crisis which ensued, were in particularly serious straits. It emphasised the urgent necessity of coming to the assistance of such countries and also, in a general way of promoting intellectual interchanges of all kinds, more especially the exchange of publications and the interchange of professors and students.

With the encouragement of the third Assembly, the Committee devoted a whole year to the consideration of this problem, and, on the basis of practical experience, drew up a systematic scheme of action, which it finally determined during its second session held at Geneva from July 26th to August 2nd, 1923. The basis of the scheme is the formation of national Committees on intellectual co-operation in the various countries. The International Committee thinks that these committees would provide the best machinery for organising mutual intellectual assistance and promoting interchanges. In the Committee's opinion, this organisation which has been first set up in those countries which suffered most heavily through the war, should subsequently be extended to those in which intellectual life is in a more satisfactory position.

At its meeting on September 10th, 1923, the Council welcomed the formation of these national committees which it regarded as containing "the germs of a promising organisation, which is entirely in conformity with the principles of the League of Nations and will entail little expense." The fourth Assembly also approved the scheme, and, at its meeting on September 27th, 1923, adopted, among other resolutions the following:—

- (1) "The Assembly is of opinion that National Committees should also be established in those countries which have already organised intellectual co-operation on definite lines and in a different way.
- (2) The Assembly requests the Council to ask the Governments of the Members of the League of Nations to be good enough to lend their moral and financial support to these National Committees—if they have not already done so—and to authorise the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to receive, from any institution or private persons interested in the work, funds destined for this purpose."

This second resolution, calling for action on the part of the Council, was approved by the latter at its meeting held on December 13th, 1923. The Council took the opportunity of congratulating the Committee on the remarkable results which it had achieved. It referred principally to the results of the third plenary session of the Committee, which had just been held in Paris from December 5th to 8th, 1923, and had been attended by delegates of those national committees which had so far been established on a definite footing.

A list of these Committees is attached, together with the "Suggestions relative to the organisation of national committees on intellectual co-operation" adopted at that session, and the text of an appeal on behalf of the National Committees which the International Committee has recently issued.

In pursuance of the resolutions quoted above, I have the honour, on behalf of the Council, to request your Government to be good enough to consider the possibility of forming a National Committee in your country, or to mention any institution which might be consulted by the International Committee with a view to the formation of such a committee, and to lend its moral and financial support to this national committee when it has been formed.

I should be much obliged if you would kindly inform me of any decisions reached by your Government on this subject, and I will duly communicate such decisions to the Members of the Council.

I have the honour to be,

Secretary-General.

SUGGESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL COMMITTEES ON INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

adopted at the Third Plenary Session of the International Committee on December 5th, 1923.

1. The aims of the National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation shall be as follows:—

- (a) To act as intermediaries between the intellectual organisations in their respective countries and the International Committee appointed by the Council of the League of Nations;
- (b) To assist in the enquiry on the conditions of intellectual life undertaken by this Committee;
- (c) To transmit, either to the secretariat of the International Committee, or directly to the other National Com-

mittees concerned, the more urgent requests of intellectual institutions and workers in their respective countries, especially as regards books and instruments, travelling facilities and inter-university exchanges;

- (d) To comply as far as possible with requests of the same nature which they may receive through the secretariat of the International Committee or directly from the other National Committees.

2. The National Committees shall themselves determine their relations with their Governments and their rules of procedure and composition. Their constitution shall be governed by their own views and by the conditions and possibilities in each country. In countries in which several bodies are at work in the field of intellectual co-operation, they shall be requested to form one Committee if possible; they shall in any case agree to appoint a common delegate to represent them in their relations with the International Committee. It is desirable that each National Committee should include representatives of the following bodies:—

- (a) Institutions or associations which have already been created for the encouragement of intellectual co-operation at home or with foreign countries;
- (b) Organisations concerned with the various manifestations of human thought (academies, learned societies, literary societies, artistic societies, etc.);
- (c) The universities; either particular universities or national inter-university organisations;
- (d) The National Libraries, Bibliographical Institutes and offices for the exchange of publications;
- (e) The professional associations or the national federations of intellectual workers.

3. Each National Committee shall appoint one of its members to take charge of correspondence with the secretariat of the International Committee and with the other National Committees. The name and address of this member, together with full details in regard to the composition and working of the National Committee, and all communications or proposals which the latter may desire to make, shall be sent to the secretariat of the International Committee, which will publish them in the *Bulletin of the International University Information Office*.

APPENDIX C.

Resolutions passed by the Universities' Conference
held at Simla from 19th to 23rd May 1924.

ARRANGED IN ORDER OF PROGRAMME (p. iii).

*The Appointment and Conditions of Service of University
teachers. (Item i.)*

1. That whatever may be the appointing authority, University teachers should be selected by a small selection committee which in the case of major appointments should contain experts who are not teachers or officers of the University or of the colleges under its jurisdiction. (See page 24.)
Method of Selection.
2. That such committee should consist of the Vice-Chancellor and representatives of the executive and academic bodies in addition to external experts in the case of major appointments. (See page 24.)
3. That it is desirable that the total number of members of such a committee should not ordinarily exceed nine. (See page 24.)
4. That it is desirable that in order to secure the best men available, University teachers should have security of tenure and that appointments should be permanent, with an age limit of 55 or 60 years; in order, however, to safeguard the interests of the Universities, such appointments should, except in the case of experienced men who have already gained distinction in their subject, be in the first instance for a term of three years and be subject to confirmation at the end of that period. (Page 24.)
Length of Service.
5. That the foregoing arrangements should not exclude the establishment of short-term appointments in special cases. (Page 25.)
6. That in the opinion of the Conference there should be a mutual understanding between universities to the effect that whole-time University teachers should not ordinarily be at liberty to determine their appointments without giving six months' notice. (Page 26.)
7. That it is desirable that University teachers be exempted from language tests, except when such tests have a direct bearing on the work for which they have been appointed. (Page 25.)
Exemption from Language Tests.

8. That in view of the disparity of conditions the Conference does not think that it is either possible or desirable to make any recommendations regarding salary or leave for University teachers, but it regards it as desirable that this matter should be considered by any permanent inter-university organisation which may be formed. (Page 25.)

9. That it is desirable that there should be a provident fund for whole-time permanent teachers and officers of every university to which the persons concerned and the universities should contribute. (Page 26.)

10. That it is desirable that the contribution of the subscriber should not be less than $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. (one anna in the rupee) and that of the University not less 10 per cent. of the salary in each case. (Page 26.)

11. That this Conference recommends for the favourable consideration of any permanent inter-university organisation which may be established, the foundation of a common provident fund for Indian universities on lines similar to, though not necessarily identical with, those of the Federated Superannuation Fund of the British Universities. (Page 26.)

12. That the Government of India be requested to apply the provisions of the Provident Funds Act of 1897 to the Provident Funds of Indian universities established by the Legislature and exempt contribution so made to them from payment of income-tax. (Page 27.)

13. That this Conference approves on principle the exchange of teachers between different universities, the details being settled in every case by the universities concerned. (Page 27.)

14. That in the opinion of this Conference it is desirable that universities in India should combine to invite distinguished teachers from abroad to deliver courses of lectures at different centres; and that the further consideration of this question should be referred to any permanent inter-university organisation that may be founded. (Page 28.)

Libraries. (Item ii.)

15. That universities should facilitate the issue of books and manuscripts to professors of other universities under such safeguards as may be necessary, though it is not practicable to make any recommendation with regard to the exchange and gift of books among Indian universities. (Page 28.)

16. That the India Office, the Government of India and the Provincial Governments should supply copies of all their publications free of cost to each university in India. (Page 28.)

Free supply of Government Publications.

17. That the libraries of the Imperial Government should be accessible wherever possible to professors of Indian universities. (Page 28.)

Admission to Government Libraries.

The constitution of a Central Advisory Board for Scientific Research.
(Item iii.)

18. That it be recommended to the Government of India, that with a view to promoting co-operation among Indian universities in higher scientific studies and research and to advising the Government of India from time to time generally with regard to the promotion of scientific research in India, a central advisory board for scientific research be constituted in India comprising the heads of scientific departments of the Government of India and a representative of science nominated by each of the Indian universities and by the Indian Institute of Science, with power to co-opt representatives of other recognised institutes of science not affiliated to any university. (Page 35.)

Constitution and functions of the Board.

19. That it is not desirable to have only a single Journal of Science for the whole of India but that there should be all-India journals dealing with special branches of knowledge, and (i) that efforts should be made to utilize or combine existing organs of publication and to develop them into publications having an all-India basis, and (ii) that the Central Advisory Committees for Scientific Research should be entrusted with the task of co-ordinating scientific publications in India and recommending to Government cases where financial assistance from the State would be desirable. (Page 37.)

Publication of Scientific Journals.

20. That the Central Advisory Committee for Scientific Research be asked to consider whether the records of the Indian Museum (a journal of Indian Zoology), the records of the Botanical Survey of India, Memoirs of the Geological Survey of India and the Agricultural Journal of India, now issued by Government, should not have on their editorial boards expert representatives of the various universities and whether the scope of these journals should not be enlarged. (Page 37.)

21. That the Government of India be requested to remit the payment of customs duty on scientific apparatus and chemicals imported for the use of universities and other approved educational institutions. (Page 38.)

Exemption of Scientific apparatus and chemicals from customs duty.

Lytton Committee's Report. (Item v.)

22. That the substitution of University Students' Information Bureaux for students' advisory committees is desirable, provided that two or more universities may, if they so desire, form a combined bureau. (Page 10.)

23. That the constitution of the University Students' Information Bureaux is a matter for final determination by the Universities. (Page 10.)

24. That (a) the proposed University Students' Information Bureaux, when formed, may use the existing organisation in the United Kingdom; and that

(b) the question of forming a separate central agency in London for Indian universities may be deferred till further experience has been gained of the working of the proposed University Bureaux. (Page 36.)

The New Statute of Oxford University. (Item vi.)

25. That this Conference desires to represent to the University of Oxford the serious disability imposed on Indian graduates by the new Statute requiring as a qualification for admission to the status of a junior student that a candidate must have taken Latin, Greek, French or German for his degree. (Page 39.)

University Training Corps. (Item vii.)

26. That this Conference recommends to the military authorities that examinations for A and B certificates be instituted in the university training corps. (Page 22.)

27. That the system of allotting Commissions in the university training corps should be revised. (Page 22.)

28. That some central body should be created for the distribution of information about university training corps and that all battalions of university training corps should be kept in touch with one another. (Page 22.)

29. That more money should be allotted to the university training corps for training camps and that the universities should supplement these funds. (Page 22.)

30. That some efforts should be made to ensure closer working between the university training corps and the battalions of the Territorial force. (Page 22.)

Sapper Companies and Medical units.

31. That where the material is available, permission should be given to start Sapper Companies and Medical Units. (Page 22.)

32. That Anglo-Indians should be permitted to enter university training corps. (Page 22.)

33. That facilities should be extended to university training Participation in inter-army corps to take part in inter-army competitions and rifle meetings. (Page 22.)

34. That this Conference recommends to Indian universities that the holding of A and B certificates be taken into account in assessing the value of an appearance at an examination. (Page 22.)

Recognition of corps work for University examinations.

Modern Languages in University Curricula. (Item x.)

Indian vernaculars.

35. This Conference is of opinion:—

(a) that composition in a modern Indian language should be prescribed as a compulsory subject at the matriculation or admission examination to Indian universities and at the Intermediate examinations in Arts and Science;

(b) that a modern Indian language and literature should be recognised as an optional subject at the Intermediate in Arts, Bachelor and Master of Arts examinations. (Page 23.)

36. That in the interest of those students taking an Honours or Post-graduate degree in Science or Arts, facilities should be provided by Indian universities for the study of French and German. (Page 23.)

Modern European languages.

The Constitution of an Inter-University Board. (Item xi.)

Functions of the Board.

37. That it is necessary to have a central agency in India:—

- (a) to act as an inter-university organisation and bureau of information;
- (b) to facilitate the exchange of professors;
- (c) to serve as an authorised channel of communication and facilitate the co-ordination of university work;
- (d) to assist Indian universities in obtaining recognition for their degrees, diplomas and examinations in other countries;
- (e) to appoint or recommend, where necessary, a common representative or representatives of India at Imperial or International conferences on higher education;

- (f) to act as an appointments bureau for Indian universities;
- (g) to fulfil such other duties as may be assigned to it from time to time by the Indian universities. (Pages 29-32.)

38. (i) That the Board should consist of one representative appointed by each university (Page 32);

(ii) That the members shall ordinarily hold office for three years but during the first triennial period one-third shall retire at the end of one year, and one-third at the end of the second year, the allocation to be made by lot (Page 33);

(iii) That the Government of India may nominate from time to time a representative to attend meetings of the Board in an advisory capacity. (Page 33.)

39. That the Board shall decide where its permanent headquarters shall be; but pending such decision its office shall be at the headquarters of the Government of India. The Board shall meet at such centres as may be decided by the Board from time to time: the Board shall meet at least once a year. (Page 33.)

40. (i) That the cost of maintaining the Board be met by equal contributions from the universities;

(ii) that the Government of India and the provincial governments be requested to make grants towards the expenses of the Board. (Page 34.)

Travelling Allowance to attend First Meeting. 41. That the travelling allowance of the Board at its first meeting should be defrayed by the Government of India. (Page 34.)

42. That on the Board coming into existence the Government of India be requested to intimate to the International Committee of the League of Nations on Intellectual Co-operation that the proposed inter-university organisation should be recognised as an institution which the International Committee should consult with a view to the formation of an Indian National Committee. (Page 34.)

43. That in the opinion of this Conference economy in university finance and increase in efficiency will be rendered possible by the co-ordination of post-graduate studies in Indian universities. (Page 36.)

44. That the recommendations of the Committee on the equivalence of examinations and the amendments moved at the Conference be forwarded to the inter-University Board for report to the next Conference. (Page 43.)

45. That the Inter-University Board, when constituted, should consider whether it is necessary that the Government should take some steps, legislative or otherwise, to prevent the sale and use of bogus degrees in India. (Page 43.)

Bogus degrees.

46. (i) That it be a recommendation to local governments that grants made to universities be ordinarily block grants;

Grants to Universities.

(ii) that the Inter-University Board, when established, be requested to consider the question of the financial relations of the universities with local governments. (Page 43.)

47. That the Conference requests the representatives of each university to nominate a member to serve on a provisional committee to meet at Simla immediately after the conclusion of the Conference for the purpose of making to the universities further detailed suggestions with regard to the formation of an Inter-University Board, on such subjects as (i) the date by which the reports of the universities in response to the resolutions of the Conference should be received; (ii) the initial financial requirements of the proposed Board, and (iii) the practical arrangements to be made for the first meeting of the Board including the place of its first meeting. (Page 41.)

Provisional Committee.

48. That the Conference requests the Government of India to forward the resolutions of the Conference and of the provisional committees relating to the proposed Inter-University Board to the Indian universities, and if the majority of the universities agree to these resolutions, to make arrangements in accordance with the conclusions adopted by these universities, for the first meeting of the Inter-University Board. (Page 41.)

Procedure.

49. That the cordial thanks of this Conference of the Universities of India be offered to the Hon'ble Sir Narasimha Sarma for the very great service which he has rendered to the Indian universities by summoning the Conference, and by his courteous and able conduct in the Chair; and that the warm thanks of the Conference be also accorded to the Hon'ble Mr. Richey for his services in making arrangements for the organisation of this Conference and to Mr. Rushbrook Williams as its Secretary. (Page 43.)

Vote of thanks.

APPENDIX D.

Minutes of the meeting held on May the 24th, 1924, of the Provisional Committee appointed by resolution 47 of the Universities' Conference.

1. Mr. J. A. Richey, Educational Commissioner, reported that the following delegates had been appointed as members of the Provisional Committee by the Universities' Conference:—

1. Principal H. C. Maitra . . . Calcutta University.
2. Mr. V. G. Kale . . . Bombay University.
3. Dr. E. M. Macphail . . . Madras University.
4. Sir John Maynard . . . Punjab University.
5. Dr. N. R. Dhar . . . Allahabad University.
6. Mr. A. B. Dhruva . . . Benares Hindu University.
7. Mr. N. S. Subba Rao . . . Mysore University.
8. Mr. E. A. Horne . . . Patna University.
9. Mr. A. Hydari . . . Osmania University.
10. Dr. L. K. Hyder . . . Aligarh Muslim University.
11. Mr. L. G. Owen . . . Rangoon University.
12. Dr. R. K. Mukerji . . . Lucknow University.
13. Mr. P. J. Hartog . . . Dacca University.
14. Dr. H. S. Gour . . . Delhi University.
15. Rai Bahadur V. R. Pandit Nagpur University.

2. All the members of the Committee were present except Mr. N. S. Subba Rao, Mysore University, who was unavoidably absent, but concurred in the findings of the Committee, and Dr. H. S. Gour, Delhi University, who was also unavoidably absent.

3. Sir John Maynard, Punjab University, was elected to the Chair.

Resolution 47.—That the Conference requests the representatives of each University to nominate a member to serve on a Provisional Committee to meet at Simla immediately after the conclusion of the Conference for the purpose of making to the universities further detailed suggestions with regard to the formation of an inter-university board on such subjects as (1) the date by which the reports of the universities in response to the resolutions of the Conference should be received, (2) the initial financial requirements of the proposed board, and (3) the practical arrangements to be made for the first meeting of the board, including the place of its first meeting.

Resolution 48.—That the Conference requests the Government to forward the resolutions of the Conference and of the Provisional Committee relating to the proposed inter-university board to the Indian universities, and if the majority of the universities agree to these resolutions, to make arrangements in accordance with the conclusions adopted by these universities, for the first meeting of the inter-university board.

4. The Committee resolved to suggest that replies from the universities on the resolutions of the Conference relating to the constitution of an Inter-University Board should be received by December the 1st, 1924.

5. It was recognised that the proposed inter-university board, if constituted, would frame its own budget. But in order to give to the universities a clear view of the functions contemplated for the inter-university board and of its probable expenditure, the following draft estimates were framed:—

Recurring (average).

	Rs.	Rs.
Whole-time Secretary (on Rs. 600—50—700)	7,800	
Stenographer (on Rs. 100—10—200)	1,320	
Clerk (on Rs. 70—5—80)	900	
Three menials (Rs. 45 p.m.)	540	
Provident Fund at 10 per cent.	1,056	
Travelling allowance of staff	1,000	
Rent of office	1,000	
Postage, stationery and contingencies	2,000	
Printing charges (exclusive of cost of printing Indian Universities' Hand Book)	1,000	
Purchase of books for a library of reference dealing with university education	1,384	
		18,000

Non-recurring.

Initial equipment and cost of first issue of Indian Universities Hand Book:—

	Rs.	Rs.
Duplicator	1,500	
Typewriter	400	
Furniture	1,100	
Printing of Indian Universities' Hand Book	3,000	
		6,000
GRAND TOTAL		24,000

N.B.—It was suggested that a supplement to the Handbook with corrections might be issued in each of the two years succeeding the first year of issue, so that a new edition would not be required till the third year.

6. If the universities agree to the constitution of the proposed inter-university board on the lines contemplated, the *maximum* contribution from each university, if all fifteen universities join in the formation of the board, will be Rs. 1,600 per annum, which would

be reduced proportionately by the amount of any grant made by the Government of India to whom an application for a grant should be addressed in accordance with the decision of the Conference.

The Committee suggest that each university should guarantee an annual contribution of a maximum amount of Rs. 1,600 for a term of three years with effect from April the 1st, 1925, and that an advance payment of not less than Rs. 100 should be made by each university on February 1st, 1925, to meet certain preliminary expenses.

7. The Committee suggest that the first meeting of the Inter-University Board should be held in Calcutta, if possible, in February next and not later than March 1925.

J. MAYNARD,
Chairman

Publications of the Bureau of Education, India.

Quinquennial Reviews.

- Progress of Education in India, 1892-98 to 1896-97. Third Quinquennial Review. By J. S. Cotton. Rs. 3.
- Progress of Education in India, 1897-98 to 1901-02. Fourth Quinquennial Review. By R. Nathan, C.I.E. 2 Vols. Rs. 7.
- Progress of Education in India, 1907-12. Sixth Quinquennial Review. By H. W. Orange, C.I.E. 2 Vols. Rs. 5-8-0.
- Progress of Education in India, 1907-12. Sixth Quinquennial Review. By H. Sharp, C.I.E. Vol. I, Rs. 4; Vol. II, Rs. 2.
- Progress of Education in India, 1912-17. Seventh Quinquennial Review. By H. Sharp, C.S.I., C.I.E. Vol. I, Rs. 3-10; Vol. II, Rs. 2.
- Progress of Education in India, 1917-22. Eighth Quinquennial Review. By J. A. Richey, C.I.E. Vol. I, Re. 1-6; Vol. II, Re. 1-4.

Miscellaneous Reports.

- Report on the Conference on the Education of the Domiciled Community in India, July 1912 (1912). Re. 1.
- Report on the enquiry to bring Technical Institutions into closer touch and more practical relations with the employers of Labour in India. By Lieutenant-Colonel E. H. deV. Atkinson, R.E., and T. S. Dawson (1912). As. 10.
- Papers regarding the Educational Conference, Allahabad, February 1911 (1911). Re. 1-8-0.
- The Essentials of a University in a Great Centre of Population (1917). As. 6.

Annual Narratives.

- Indian Education in 1913-14. Re. 1-8-0.
- Indian Education in 1914-15. Rs. 2.
- Indian Education in 1915-16. As. 8.
- Indian Education in 1917-18. As. 12.
- Indian Education in 1918-19. Re. 1-8-0.
- Indian Education in 1919-20. Rs. 2-2-0.
- Indian Education in 1920-21. Re. 1-8-0.
- Indian Education in 1922-23. (*In the Press.*)

Occasional Reports.

- No. 1. Rural Schools in the Central Provinces. By H. Sharp (1904). Re. 1.
- No. 2. Vernacular Reading Books in the Bombay Presidency. By J. G. Covernton (1906). (*Out of print.*)
- No. 3. The Educational System of Japan. By W. H. Sharp (1906). (*Out of print.*)
- No. 4. Furlough Studies. By J. Nelson Fraser, H. Sharp and G. W. Kuchler (1906). Rs. 2.
- No. 5. Training of Secondary Teachers. By H. R. James, H. Sharp and J. Nelson Fraser (1909). As. 8.
- No. 6. Educational Buildings in India (1911). Rs. 5.
- No. 7. Methods of School Inspection in England. By H. G. Wyatt (1917). As. 8.
- No. 8. The Training of Teachers. By H. S. Duncan and A. H. Mackenzie (1919). As. 8.

- No. 9. The Planning and Fitting up of School Laboratories. By M. O. S. A. Rao (1921). Re. 1-4-0.
- No. 10. Adult Education in England and Wales. By J. P. Bulkeley (1922). As. 8.
- No. 11. Rural School Teachers in the United States of America. By H. G. Wyatt, I.E.S. (1923). As. 8.
- No. 12. Grant-in-Aid to Schools in British India. By J. A. Richey, C.I.E. (1923). As. 10.

Bureau of Education Pamphlets.

- No. 1. Drawing and Manual Training in Punjab Schools. By J. Y. Buchanan (1918). As. 8.
- No. 2. Education of Factory Children in India (1918). As. 6.
- No. 3. Extracts from the Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister to enquire into the position of Natural Science in the Educational System of Great Britain (1918). As. 4.
- No. 4. Extracts from the Report of the Commissioner of Education, Washington, 1916, regarding Vocational Education (1918). As. 3.
- No. 5. Notes on Vernacular Education in Ceylon. By H. Sharp, C.S.I., C.I.E. (1919). As. 12.
- No. 6. Indian State Scholarships (1919). As. 12.
- No. 7. Facilities for Indian Students in America and Japan. By R. K. Sorabji, M.A., Bar-at-Law (1920). As. 2.
- No. 8. Libraries in Indian High Schools. By L. T. Watkins, M.A., I.E.S. (1920). As. 4.
- No. 9. State Examinations in Scottish Schools. By A. H. Mackenzie, M.A. (1921). As. 5.
- No. 10. Visual Instruction in Baroda. By D. Swarkar, L.C.E. (1921). One anna.
- No. 11. Education at Jamshedpur. By G. E. Fawcett, M.A., and M. D. Madan, M.L.C. (1921). One anna.
- No. 12. Science Teaching in England. By H. Banister (1922). As. 7.
- No. 13. Question Papers set for the Indian (Imperial) Police Examination, 1921. As. 8.
- No. 14. Question Papers set for the Indian (Imperial) Police Examination, 1922. As. 8.
- No. 15. Provisional Series of Mental Intelligence Tests for Indian Scholars. By J. A. Richey, C.I.E. (1924). As. 3.
- No. 16. Impressions of the Imperial Education Conference, 1923. By F. R. Tomlinson, M.A., I.E.S. (1924). As. 2.
- No. 17. Question Papers set for the Indian (Imperial) Police Examination, 1923. As. 8.

Records Series.

- Selections from Educational Records, Part I. By H. Sharp, C.S.I., C.I.E. (1920). Rs. 2-8-0.
- Selections from Educational Records, Part II. By J. A. Richey, C.I.E. (1922). Rs. 6-8-0.

To be had from the Manager, Government of India, Central Publication Branch, 8, Hastings Street, Calcutta, or any of his agents (*vide* list on back of front cover).

